272.05 W-86
Woodstock Letters 42162
Volume 95 (1966)

272.05 W-86 42162
Woodstock Letters
Volume 95 (1966)

MO. PROV. S. J.
3700 W. PINE
ST. LOUIS, MO

272.05
W-86

DATE DUE

MAY 2 8 1981

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

SPRING 1966

Volume 95 Number 2

INTRODUCTION

The changing concept of authority in the religious life, which parallels the new feeling of freedom and openness which has followed Vatican II, makes the lead article by ***Miguel A. Fiorito, S.J.***, particularly timely as the whole Society looks forward to the second session of the General Congregation. Fr. Fiorito is Dean of the Jesuit philosophate at San Miguel, near Buenos Aires, and director of the scholarly periodical *Stromata,* formerly *Ciencia y Fe.* We shall continue the reexamination of religious obedience in future issues, as part of our general effort—as in the annual Ignatian Survey—to understand and discuss the Society's current problems in their historical perspective.

The impact of the Society's mission regarding atheism will be felt for many years to come. To help Jesuits begin the serious reflection now required by this mandate of the Pope, we present a revised translation of the decree of the General Congregation, the document of primary importance. ***Fr. Arrupe***'s Council speech on atheism, presented here in full, is interpreted in the light of the work of the Congregation by ***Robert Rouquette, S.J.***, who has been reporting on the Council sessions for *Études.* ***Peter Hebblethwaite, S.J.***, assistant editor of the *Month,* provides further insight into the General's position in an interview reprinted from the *Tablet.*

The symposium on the status of our high schools is inspired both by the coming 1966 JEA Workshop on the Christian Formation of High School Students to be held in Los Angeles in August and by the widespread feelings that the graduates of our schools have not had a sufficient impact on modern society. It also comes at a time when there is talk—some loose and some well-founded—of closing some of our schools.

The Summer issue will feature our promised report on Jesuit artists by ***C. J. McNaspy, S.J.***, another discussion of the need for communication between generations, and several articles on prayer.

CONTENTS

SPRING, 1966

INTRODUCTION

137 ST. IGNATIUS' INTUITIONS ON OBEDIENCE AND THEIR WRITTEN JURIDICAL EXPRESSION • *Miguel A. Fiorito, S.J.*

143 DECREE OF THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: ON THE TASK OF THE SOCIETY CONCERNING ATHEISM

147 VATICAN II—SCHEMA 13: THE SPEECH ON ATHEISM • *Peter Arrupe, S.J.*

151 THE SPEECH ON ATHEISM: AN INTERPRETATION • *Robert Rouquette, S.J.*

156 THE GENERAL'S LOT • *Peter Hebblethwaite, S.J.*

161 THE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL: AN EVALUATION • *Kenneth DeLuca, S.J., ed.*

163 Subversive Teachers • *Michael P. Kammer, S.J.*

169 Toward Honest Reappraisal • *Kenneth DeLuca, S.J., and Thomas Gleeson, S.J.*

179 Christian Community • *Joseph J. Feeney, S.J.*

190 Proposal for a National Association • *William J. Kerr, S.J.*

198 Theologate Reports

217 Additional Comments

228 IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1965 • *Robert C. Collins, S.J., ed.*

REPORTS

245 Institute on Jewish-Christian Relations: St. Mary's, Kansas • *Thomas N. Lay, S.J.*

250 Institute on Jewish-Christian Relations: Woodstock, Maryland • *David S. Toolan, S.J.*

READERS' FORUM

255 Loss of Faith • *James Gaffney, S.J.*

255 The Graduate School Trap • *Richard A. Blake, S.J.*

REVIEWS

257 Faith and the Adolescent • *R. K. Judge, S.J.*

260 Disciplined Selfhood • *C. Donnelly, S.J.*

SELECTED READINGS

262 Conjugal Spirituality • *George B. Wilson, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609–16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. Editor: Thomas J. O'Donnell, S.J./Managing Editor: Raymond A. Schroth, S.J./Associate Editors: Robert C. Collins, S.J., James P. Jurich, S.J., P. Kenneth Kania, S.J./Book Editor: Kenneth J. DeLuca, S.J./Assistant Editors: R. Emmett Curran, S.J., Robert E. Hamm, S.J., Michael C. Reilly, S.J./Business Manager: Paul L. Horgan, S.J./Subscription Manager: Edward F. Salmon, S.J.

ST. IGNATIUS' INTUITIONS ON OBEDIENCE AND THEIR WRITTEN JURIDICAL EXPRESSION

the superior's decision ought not to be isolated

MIGUEL A. FIORITO, S.J.

IN THE EARLY DAYS OF ANY RELIGIOUS ORDER, the driving charismatic spirit of the founder or founders must be put into written juridical expressions.[1] Unfortunately, this writing always entails a danger, as almost all history testifies.

Is there then, perhaps, some difference between St. Ignatius of Loyola as founder and as legislator? Or better, were those deeper spiritual intuitions and insights which he had as founder adequately transferred into the written juridical expressions or statements which he had to use as legislator? Poets usually fall somewhat short of

---

Translated by George E. Ganss, S.J. [The present article has an interesting origin. Some weeks ago, Very Reverend Pedro Arrupe remarked to me during an informal conversation about preparations for Session II of our General Congregation: "Perhaps it would be useful to explore whether there is a difference between St. Ignatius as founder and as legislator, that is, between his deeper spiritual intuitions and the written laws by which he tried to express them. Perhaps his written laws sometimes fail to express fully his deeper thought or spirit."

Discussing the feasibility of such an exploration, several of us stated that although it would be useful, it could scarcely be brought to sufficiently definite and practical conclusions before Session II opens in September, 1966. The present article makes me think that we were wrong.

In spite of my doubts, I broached the idea, in passing, to Fr. Fiorito. He found it a challenge and accepted it. As a sample of what such investigation might yield, he sent me this study of one aspect of obedience as conceived by St. Ignatius. The timeliness and worth of the article stimulated me to translate it for publication.—Translator's note.]

[1] See M. A. Fiorito, "Alianza bíblica y regla religiosa: Estudio historico-salvifico de las Constituciones de la Compañía de Jesús," *Stromata* 21 (1965) 291–324, esp. 318–24.

their aim when they try to commit the full richness of their vision to paper; and possibly St. Ignatius experienced similar misfortune. Further still, with the passing of time after his death, what happened in the evolving tradition of the Society he founded? Did some of his juridical expressions perhaps receive from his successors such emphasis, often unbalanced, that these later Jesuits gradually hid the deeper spiritual intuitions which he had as founder, and thus allowed them to be overlooked?

The present writer received a suggestion to explore this topic. He offers the present study of St. Ignatius' concept of obedience as a sample of what such investigation might yield.

Both in the Church and in the Society of Jesus, the juridical or written expression of life under obedience has evolved in such a manner that important helps to the practice of obedience have been obscured or lost.

In St. Ignatius' deeper intuition, obedience has a threefold function. It is a help to the union of the Society's members through charity, a means to further a sense of community among apostolic religious through their charitable cooperation toward common ends in their common life, and a remedy for distance when its separates absent members from the community. In that total function and life-giving spirit of obedience, the superior's decision is clearly only one momentary act which ought not to be isolated from its whole vital and spiritual context.

In the juridical expression, however, the superior's decision tends to take on such prominence that all the other acts which government entails seem to have only a secondary role or are even overlooked. But for the life of union through charity they are as necessary as the decision itself.

In Ignatius' spiritual concept of obedience, the decision is one act which ought to be integrated into the other activities which produce the sense of community or cooperative living, such as the manifestation of conscience, personal conversation between the superior and subject, and the like. Ribadeneyra makes this clear in Chapter 3 of his *De ratione quam in gubernando tenebat Ignatius*.[2] However, in the juridical expression of obedience, the

[2] *Fontes Narrativi de S. Ignatio,* III, pp. 615–19, in the series "Monumenta Historica S.J." (henceforth abbreviated MHSJ).

decision seems to be virtually everything, much as it is in the purely natural obedience of a pagan.

In the *Deliberation of the First Fathers* in 1539, Ignatius and his companions deliberated first about union "in one body" and then about obedience.[3] They reached agreement quickly about union but employed "many days" about obedience.[4] Among the three fundamental reasons they mention for choosing it, the second is: Obedience is a means to preserve the Society as a body.[5]

Reflection on this reveals an aspect in which Ignatian poverty and obedience are alike. If poverty is viewed as something isolated from the apostolic end, it becomes the poverty proper to other religious institutes. So too obedience, if it is isolated from its primary purpose of union into one body or religious community, is reduced to the purely natural obedience which a pagan might practice in an earthly commonwealth.

If we allow the juridical expression of obedience to occupy the chief role in our living on a supernatural plane, we create various conflicts quite like those found in purely natural types of social living. Examples are, in the Church, a conflict between the primacy of the Holy Father and the collegiality of the bishops, and in the Society, between the superior's authority to decide and his obligation to hold consultation with his subjects.

The juridical expression of obedience tends to emphasize the authority and its sufficiency, while the spiritual and Christian expression of obedience emphasizes the fact that the superior needs his subjects and they him, as St. Paul so clearly states (1 Cor. 12:2–25). The head "cannot say . . . to the feet, I have no need of you" (*ibid.*, 21).[6]

Ambiguous consequences

The unbalanced emphasis which St. Ignatius' successors have often put upon the merely juridical expression of obedience has

[3] *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu* (in MHSJ), I, n. 3 on p. 3, n. 4 on p. 4 (henceforth abbreviated *Cons*MHSJ).

[4] *Ibid.*, n. 8 on p. 7.

[5] *Ibid.;* cf. *Epistolae S. Ignatii* (MHSJ), XII, pp. 331–34.

[6] Hence Paul's concept of authority, according to one exegete, entails not merely service but also need. See J. M. González Rúiz, "¿La autoridad como servicio?" *Hechos y Dichos,* n. 351 (1965) 257–60.

given rise to ambiguous consequences: for example, that of defining Ignatian government as "monarchical." This definition is correct only if there is question of affirming that there is only one head who is also a member in a kind of mystical body, in the same way as Christ is the head of the Church. But the definition is erroneous if "monarchical" is made or taken to mean that there is only one leader who imposes himself from without, much like a conqueror who imposes himself from without and remains separate from the conquered people. In the *Constitutions* of the Society, St. Ignatius calls the Father General "head" (*cabeza*) sixteen times; and nine of these instances, the majority, are in Part VIII, where he is treating explicitly about means and "Helps toward Uniting the Distant Members with Their Head and among Themselves" (*Cons.* [655]).

The juridical expression originates in the political order. There the authority often arises from force and is measured by power.[7] In Ignatius' Christian order, however, the authority originates from Christ and His "kindness, meekness, and charity"; and in exercising authority the superior ought "always to be mindful of the formula of Peter and Paul."[8]

This "formula of Peter and Paul" which a religious superior should keep always in mind is a characteristically spiritual expression. It cannot have a completely similar juridical equivalent, because it arises from the divinely inspired words of both apostles. "The priests that are among you, I exhort, . . . shepherd the flock of God that is with you, not of necessity but willingly, neither for base gain but with a ready mind, nor yet as lording it over your charges, but becoming an example to the flock" (1 Peter 5:1–3). "Become a pattern for the faithful in word, in conduct, in charity, in faith, in chastity" (1 Tim. 4:12; cf: Phil. 3:17, 2 Thess. 3:9).[9] In the juridical expression of obedience, the superior's power and the subject's obligation spring into the foremost role, but in the Christian expression the superior's spiritual obligation to be an example becomes the most prominent part. In fact, this role of the superior becomes the animating form of the whole religious body. In all his acts and in every decision, he ought to consider the whole body and his union with it.

---

[7] See G. Fessard, *Autorité et bien commun* (Paris, 1944), pp. 14–15.

[8] *Formula Instituti* (*Regimini*, 1540), n. 5, in *Cons*MHSJ, I, p. 28.

[9] See *Cons*MHSJ, I, p. 379, n. 17.

That expression, "the formula of Peter and Paul," first appeared in the *Prima Societatis Jesu Instituti Summa* of 1539 and persisted in the *Formulae* of 1540 and 1550.[10] The ideas in "the formula of Peter and Paul" are derived from inspired Scripture just as truly as the other expression, head (Ephes. 1:23), which has the well-known Christocentric and Christological connotations that cannot be transferred into a purely natural juridical language. For that "bringing all things to a head in Christ" (*anakephalaiosis*) takes on its full meaning only in the case of the unique mediator, Christ, even though it does have earlier but weaker analogies in the political literature of antiquity.

When one expresses religious obedience by terms which are spiritual, Christological, Petrine, and Pauline, he can readily insert into its practice such functions as dialogue, consultation, mutual information, committee discussions, and similar elements or expressions dear to modern men. But only with great difficulty do they fit into the juridical expression of obedience which makes the superior's decision the beginning and end of the matter. All these elements dear to moderns are, like the Ignatian concept of manifestation of conscience, means to developing a cooperative sense of community among those living a common life. They are means to union through fraternal charity and leadership by example. By that very fact they become a necessary means as well as an integral part in the government of a religious community.

The subject's role of obeying is a simple one and it can easily be expressed, even quite fully, in juridical language. But the superior's role contains spiritual elements which are richer, multitudinous, and very complex. They cannot easily be described in terms of black and white. And it is extremely difficult to express the necessary but delicate shadings in a written law or in terms which are exclusively juridical. This fact leads to an important consequence.

We indicated above that the juridical expression of obedience has gone through an excessive or unbalanced evolution both in the Church and in the Society. What we meant was this. The life of obedience in a religious community has been too much reduced to emphasis on the subject's role of obeying, although the superior's

[10] In *Cons*MHSJ, I, pp. 14–21, see esp. pp. 18, 28, 379.

role is far more important for the cooperative and charitable common living.[11]

If the benefits of group dynamics are to be reaped, the superior's role cannot be reduced to the mere making of a decision.

But if the superior's role is described with all its spiritual richness, the role of the subject will be proportionally enriched, far more than has happened so far in its juridical expression.

This becomes clearer through an interesting parallel. The theology of the past, by developing somewhat excessively and unilaterally the psychological expression of the act of faith, tended to make it too similar to a mere act of assent to historical testimony; but the theology of today, by stressing the value of the word of God and its proclamation, has once again put into full light the unique character of Christian faith. Similarly, if we express the full spiritual richness of the superior's function in a religious community, we shall by that very fact gain immense benefits for the spiritual life of the subjects in that same community.

[11] See *Epistolae S. Ignatii* (MHSJ), XII, 335–37.

Decree of the 31st General Congregation

ON THE TASK OF THE SOCIETY CONCERNING ATHEISM

(a) The spread of atheism and the Holy Father's commission to the Society

1. Since the glory of God, as the purpose of all creation, and his own good require man to acknowledge God, to show Him reverence, and to serve Him, the danger of atheism in which so many men live today should stir up the companions of Jesus to give a more perfect witness of religious life and to undertake apostolic works more eagerly. For the denial of God is not now an exceptional event, as it was in the past, but is spreading among a great number of men, among, in fact, social groups and even almost entire peoples. In certain nations the public authorities themselves are systematically propagating atheism, in violation of man's right to be free to search for the truth and to practice his religion. But much more widely, the denial of God or indifference to religion directly or indirectly infects the cultural and social life of men.

The Supreme Pontiff, Paul VI, taking the occasion of the audience for the Fathers assembled for the 31st General Congregation, has commissioned the Society, by reason of its special vow of obedience, to make a "united" stand against atheism.[1] For their part, therefore, all of Ours must eagerly but humbly devote themselves to this task in their prayer and activity, and they should be grateful that in this way they can better serve "the Lord alone and the Church, His Spouse, under the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth."[2]

(b) Knowledge of atheism and its causes and of the motivations of atheists

2. All members of the Society, whatever their apostolic work may be, should direct more attention to atheists and cultivate a deeper knowledge of atheism and of indifference to religion. They should investigate the different forms of systematic and practical atheism and examine them as thoroughly as possible.

---

[1] *AAS* 57 (1965) 511–15.

[2] Julius III, *Exposcit debitum,* July 21, 1550.

3. They should also carefully distinguish its causes: whether it is that attitude of the modern denial of God toward the changes of all kinds which are taking place in the material and social condition of men, or those "many and complex" motives which can be found "in the heart of the modern atheist" and which "require us to use prudence in passing judgment on them,"[3] or the social injustices which dispose many men, especially in developing regions, to accept the atheistic doctrines that may be bound up with programs of social reform.

(c) Some difficulties raised against belief in God and the solutions to be employed

4. With an intention that is entirely apostolic and in no way political, Ours should make use of suitable means to overcome the difficulties which are raised concerning faith, often even by believers themselves.

5. Since difficulties often arise from "the demand for a nobler and purer way of presenting divine realities than the way which prevails in certain imperfect forms of language and worship,"[4] Ours should strive to purify these representations of God and to promote among those who believe a truly personal commitment of faith.

6. Since there are also some atheists, "distinguished for a certain high-mindedness," who are spurred on by an impatience "with the mediocrity and self-seeking which infect so much of modern society,"[5] Ours should do all they can to make belief in God always lead to a genuine love of one's neighbor, a love that is both practical and social.

7. On the other hand, the legitimate desire for the autonomy of the sciences and of human initiative is often carried to the point where it gives rise to objections against the recognition of God. In fact, some men even present abandonment of religion as authentic living and as man's path to freedom. Therefore, an effort must be made to see that faith permeates and shapes the concrete totality of life. It should be made clear that the Christian life does not turn away from developing the world, that, in fact, human values, when

[3] Paul VI, *Ecclesiam Suam, AAS* 56 (1964) 652.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 653.

cultivated without pride, and the universe itself, cleansed of the corruption of sin, illuminated, and transfigured, will be part of the "eternal and universal kingdom" which Christ will give back to the Father at the end of time.

(d) Our way of life

8. First of all, members of the Society must make use of the remedies found in their own life. They should constantly cultivate an awareness of the God who is living, working, and loving, an awareness which the Exercises of our Father St. Ignatius impart through the Foundation and the Contemplation for Obtaining Love. And, as far as possible, what God is like should be evident in the way in which Ours live and act, namely, in making their own the fundamental attitude which the incarnate Word of God revealed throughout His life and especially in His supreme sacrifice, an attitude which the same Exercises call forth, beginning with the contemplation on the Kingdom of Christ.

9. Because atheists, estranged as they are from the world of religion, will be passing judgment on our life and our actions above all else, our way of living and acting must be entirely sincere; we must give up every form of pride and pretense.

(e) The formation of Ours

10. The formation of Ours should be adapted to establish and promote a spiritual life of this sort and a sincere and fraternal manner of acting. Scholastics also should be trained to understand the mentality of atheists and their theories and should be given appropriate instruction, especially in anthropology, presented in contemporary language. Furthermore, it is necessary to see to it that, insofar as possible, those especially who come from purely Christian environments can at appropriate times have some personal contacts with atheists.

(f) The hierarchy of ministries and the adaptation needed to carry out the Holy Father's commission

11. The commission to oppose atheism must permeate all the tried and tested forms of our apostolate so that among believers we cultivate true faith and an authentic awareness of God. But we must

also direct a greater part of our energy than we have thus far to those who do not believe. We must search for and experiment with new methods for coming into closer and more frequent contact with atheists, whether they belong to those sections of society most in need or to those which are more advanced.

12. In considering areas where atheism is being spread, we must put our stress upon helping the developing regions, in which religious life, because of the rapid changes taking place, is exposed to greater and more sudden disturbances.

13. But if we consider the more important causes of atheism, it is clear that we must emphasize both the social and the university apostolates, whether through our own universities or at secular universities.

14. The vigorous intellectual efforts of all our scientists, philosophers, and theologians are also needed, as well as constant cooperation among those who devote themselves to different fields, especially to the sciences dealing with man.

15. In our schools the current atheist positions should be explained and subjected to careful evaluation, not by indulging in empty polemics but by promoting the most accurate critical understanding of the atheists' arguments and attitudes of mind.

16. Ours should approach atheists with the strongest conviction that the divine law is written in the hearts of all men and with the belief that the Holy Spirit moves all men to the submission owed to God their creator. Let them endeavor to remove obstacles and to help atheists find and acknowledge God, both through preaching adapted to the individual case, joined with religious respect, and through the brotherly witness revealed in the concrete details of living and acting.

17. Consistent adaptation of the apostolate to this objective must be the concern of all superiors. Nevertheless, Father General in particular is entrusted with the duty of clearly learning through discussion with the Supreme Pontiff what his intentions are with regard to the task he has committed to us; then, with the advice of experts, he is to guide the entire apostolate of the Society in fulfilling that mission with all its energy.

Promulgated on July 15, 1965

Vatican II—Schema 13

THE SPEECH ON ATHEISM

Peter Arrupe, S.J.

The schema on the Church in the Modern World has the praiseworthy object of putting forward solutions for the problems of our times. Nevertheless, it seems to me that, in spite of the best efforts of those who have drafted the text, the solutions proposed—and especially the remarks about atheism in number 19—remain too much on the purely intellectual level. This is a mistake we have made all too commonly in the past: "The Church has the truth and the basic principles from which she can deduce valid arguments." But does she succeed in presenting these to the world in a truly effective way? That is the real question.

The contrast between what the Church possesses and what she succeeds in imparting to men has become very obvious in this modern world, which ignores God when it does not try to destroy the very notion of the Divinity. This mentality and the cultural environment that nourishes it is atheistic, at least in practice. It is like the City of Man of St. Augustine. And it not only carries on the struggle against the City of God from outside the walls, but even crosses the ramparts and enters the very territory of the City of God, insidiously influencing the minds of believers (including even religious and priests) with its hidden poison and producing its natural fruits in the Church: naturalism, distrust, rebellion.

The translation of the speech given by Father General to the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council on September 27, 1965, and issued by the NCWC Press Department.

This new godless society operates in an extremely efficient manner, at least in its higher levels of leadership. It makes use of every possible means at its disposal, be they scientific, technical, social, or economic. It follows a perfectly mapped out strategy. It holds almost complete sway in international organizations, in financial circles, in the field of mass communications: press, cinema, radio, and television.[1]

Face to face with this society stands the Church with her immense treasures of grace and truth. But we have to admit that she has not yet discovered an effective way of sharing these treasures with the men of our times. Statistics point unmistakably to this: In 1961 Catholics formed 18% of the world's population; today they form 16%, an appreciably smaller proportion.

After 2000 years we make up only a very small fraction of the population of the world, and how much of that tiny proportion can be said to be really Catholic? Undoubtedly there is an enormous amount of good in this *pusillus grex,* men of great eminence and enterprises of great worth. But taking the world as a whole, our influence is not what it should be. Our efforts are for the most part frittered away, due to want of planning and coordination.

These considerations should not lead us to pessimism. For in the world we shall be under constant pressure; the mystery of iniquity opposes itself to the progress of the Church. The growth of the Church cannot be judged by means of human criteria. Nor should we forget that, while others use certain methods which are efficacious in the world but incompatible with the Gospel, we have to preach Christ and Him crucified.

Although we keep this clearly before our eyes, we still have a grave obligation of examining our pastoral methods, especially as regards the serious problem of atheism. We naturally tend to offer an intellectual solution for this problem in terms of refuting, proving, teaching, defending. This certainly is valuable and essential, but altogether inadequate. We should communicate to others not only

[1] Nova societas athea per sua membra maxime conscia modo efficacissimo laborat; adhibet media scientifica et technica, socialia et oeconomica; sequitur strategiam perfecte elaboratam; dominium fere absolutum exercet in organizationibus internationalibus, in societatibus finantiariis, in mediis communicationis socialis, televisivis, cinematographicis, radiophonicis, in ephemeridibus.

truth, but also life. We must create rather than defend, move rather than expound; we must put truth into practice rather than contemplate it. Here are a few words of John XXIII which have a direct bearing on this subject:

"But it is indispensable, today more than ever, that this doctrine be known, assimilated, and translated into social reality in the form and manner that the different situations allow and demand; a most difficult task but a most noble one, to the carrying out of which we most warmly invite not only our brothers and sons scattered throughout the world but also all men of good will."

These words are taken from the encyclical letter *Mater et Magistra*.[2]

The transition from doctrine to practice is certainly difficult because of the constant and quick changes in a concrete situation. Often, therefore, we unconsciously evade this difficulty and seek refuge in abstract truth which is, to be sure, entirely permanent and stable, but less efficacious in the practical order.

Atheism is not exclusively or primarily a philosophical problem. Hence, apart from refuting it on the intellectual level, it is urgently necessary to establish a particular type of relationship of the individual toward God, of the family toward God, and of society toward God. These relationships must be free from any influence of atheism, be it the type which is militant and aggressive, or that which is merely practical, though it be structured and vital.

Man and society find God more readily through social action, which involves personal decisions, than through mere contemplation which perceives and reflects on the truth. Hence, it is within the framework of a society without God that we must form the community of God, the Christian community.

The fundamental remedy for dealing with the evils which spring from atheism and naturalism today lies in the formation of a Christian society, not as a separate entity—a "ghetto," as they say—but as a reality in the midst of men, a society possessed and animated by a Christian community spirit. If modern man can, as it were, breathe in an atmosphere of this kind, it will be easier for him to become a Christian or at least a man of some religious convictions. Without such an atmosphere, a few men may be drawn to the faith,

[2] *AAS* 53 (1961) 453.

but they will easily be lost in a context that is not Christian or even religious.

If we are to create an atmosphere such as this, we will have to specify in some detail what its fundamental features are and how it may be achieved. Without any doubt, social structures will need to be reformed. We will have to enter into these structures of human society if we are to change them, and enrich social, economic, and political life with the values of the Christian faith.

"It is not enough," wrote John XXIII, "that the sons of the Church should enjoy the light of divine faith and be moved by the desire to do good. Beyond that, it is necessary that they should make themselves part of the institutions of civil society, and have an impact on them from within."[3]

This is a matter of great urgency. There can be no question of further delay. Now is the time for something to be done. What must we do? Humbly, venerable Fathers, I would like to put before you a specific proposal:

1) Let the best specialists and men truly experienced in this field draw up a concrete, scientific, and accurate assessment of the situation in the world today; let us not be simply led on by the urgencies of the moment, thus wasting much energy in patching up our plans as we go along.

2) Let the basic lines of worldwide, coordinated action be drawn up, sufficiently supple to be adapted to the particular circumstances of particular places; and then let this be presented to the Supreme Pontiff.

3) The Supreme Pontiff himself, in accord with his office and his responsibility toward the whole Church, will assign various fields of labor to everyone, in order that the entire People of God, under the leadership of the pastors whom the Holy Spirit has established to rule the Church of God, may give itself vigorously to this task. Then, animated and united by a spirit of obedience and a charity as wide as the world, let all of us without exception go to work in organized fashion. This demands many sacrifices since it implies the overcoming of all selfishness, both individual and collective, and calls for a kind of collective mystical death: the sacrifice of all particularism whether it be in terms of a diocese, of one's own

[3] *Pacem in terris*, AAS 55 (1963) 296.

religious institute, of one's own social status. All of this must die that Christ may triumph in the world, just as the grain of wheat must die to bring forth fruit.

4) Let us invite all men who believe in God to this common labor that God be the Lord of human society. This collaboration in matters which are common to all men who believe in God, will it not effectively pave the way for further and deeper union, above all among those who glory in the name of Christian?

My conclusion is as follows: The bridge by which we go from truth to life is this:

1) Scientific investigation and reflection, illumined by faith and thereby given the force of prayer;

2) Absolute obedience to the Supreme Pontiff;

3) All-embracing fraternal charity, which makes of us all brothers laboring united in Christ.

We can do all these things, and we must.

THE SPEECH ON ATHEISM: AN INTERPRETATION

the intervention has been widely misunderstood

Robert Rouquette, S.J.

On september 27, in the course of the Council's discussion of Schema 13, Fr. Arrupe, the General of the Society of Jesus, presented an intervention which has, at least for the moment, caused dismay among commentators. The intervention has been widely misunderstood. Many factors combine to make the misunderstanding intelligible: Latin is poorly suited to the clear expression of modern concepts; ten minutes is all too brief a time to explain adequately a problem of so many complexities and nuances; finally, Fr. Arrupe had only recently arrived from Japan, where he had had little

A translation by Kenneth D. Hines, S.J., of "L'intervention du Père Arrupe sur l'athéisme," *Études* 323 (1965) 575-77.

opportunity to develop a sense of the mood of the Council. To correct the misunderstanding, it is only necessary to reread the text of his intervention in the light of two documents from the recent session of the Society's General Congregation: the decree on atheism (which is a response to the Holy Father's direct mandate to the Society) and the decree on studies. Both documents are, of course, normative for the General as for all Jesuits. Finally, Fr. Arrupe, who is a man of disarming simplicity and candor, readily explains his meaning.

Just as the Pope had done in his allocution to the General Congregation, Fr. Arrupe was primarily concerned to stress Christianity's vital need to meet squarely the challenges presented by this characteristic phenomenon of our day: the widespread dissemination of a quiet atheism of either a theoretical or a practical nature. He spoke of an atheistic "society" systematically working "through its most conscious members" directly or indirectly to spread the denial of God and religion. This is not to be understood in the sense of those extreme integralists who imagine a kind of international mafia, diabolical, secret and tightly organized for world domination. The point is simply to call attention to a phenomenon of collective mentality, one whose roots are far-flung and deep and which is, in fact, supported and made use of by certain individuals, organizations and political parties (without there being necessarily an organic connection between these individuals or groups); witness the systematic development of apostles of atheism in the communist countries or the powerful impact of Freemasonry in South America. As the decree on atheism stated: "The denial of God is not now an exceptional event, as it was in the past, but is spreading among a great number of men, among, in fact, social groups and even almost entire peoples. In certain nations the public authorities themselves are systematically spreading atheism." Since this is a phenomenon of collective mentality, it unconsciously affects even believers themselves.

Fr. Arrupe feels that we have not yet made an adequate analysis of the causes and modes of this universal sociological phenomenon; that is the main point of his intervention and the main point of the decree on atheism. Accordingly, he advocates a full-scale inquiry into the basic causes of the practical difficulties of faith; to this end

he envisages a coordinated effort on the part of sociologists, experts in mass psychology, economists, anthropologists, philosophers, historians and theologians drawn from all quarters of the Christian world. Fr. Arrupe insists that current difficulties in belief are not at all confined to the speculative order. He admits the need for a theoretical theodicy but stresses that of itself such a theodicy is not enough; at the same time, he feels that our apologetic is too often ineffective, poorly adapted and unaware of the problems of modern men. It is for this reason that the decree on atheism and the decree on studies in the Society recommend the direct study of contemporary thought, and not only in books, but also through personal contact with non-believers. "Scholastics should be trained," the decree on atheism says, "to understand the mentality of atheists and their theories and should be given appropriate instruction, especially in anthropology, presented in contemporary language. Furthermore, it is necessary to see to it that . . . those especially who come from purely Christian environments can . . . have some personal contacts with atheists."

Generally then, Fr. Arrupe was thinking, on a worldwide scale, of a vast investigation on the part of sociology and religious psychology similar to those conducted, especially in France, within the limits of a particular nation or region. No magic formulas emerge from such inquiries, but they make it possible to direct and coordinate all pastoral activity into what has been termed a "group apostolate." This is what Fr. Arrupe means when he says that the investigation he favors would enable us to implement a universal defensive strategy against atheism. Necessarily of broad scope, it would be a group apostolate for all Catholics. Such a project would therefore have to be quite free of anything that smacks of a crusade or any political purpose. "With an intention that is entirely apostolic and in no way political," the decree on atheism prescribes, "Ours should make use of suitable means to overcome the difficulties which are raised concerning faith. . . ."

It is impossible to predict what form such a group apostolate might take, for it would have to be the result of an analysis which, unhappily, has not as yet been made. At the outset, though, such an apostolate would have to be stripped of everything which might look like ideological warfare, brainwashing, or any of those methods

of alienating the collective conscience which are directly opposed to the whole spirit of the Council's schema on religious liberty. For the same reason, it is equally imperative that we shun those methods of commercial advertising whose object is to stimulate conditioned reflexes; even if the analyses of advertising men are somewhat analogous to our sociological investigations, one does not spread the faith in the same way as he might sell Coca-Cola.

The decree on atheism points out some general guidelines by which our apostolate might come to grips with the practical difficulties of faith; these indications can further clarify Fr. Arrupe's point. According to the decree, the following points are of primary importance in our education of the faithful: the promotion of a truer image of God, a personal commitment of faith, a "practical and social" love of neighbor, and, in accordance with Schema 13, a stress on the dignity of human values. The decree emphasizes that it would be a mistake to concentrate exclusively on the education of the faithful; it stresses the importance of devoting a considerable part of our apostolic activity to unbelievers, the uneducated as well as the intellectuals. It endorses the social apostolate and the apostolate to students. It envisages a fostering of scientific studies, the formation of solid Christian intellectuals, and a continuing cooperation among those engaged in the social sciences. Finally, the decree states that "we must put our stress upon helping the developing regions, in which religious life, because of the rapid changes taking place, is exposed to greater and more sudden disturbances." Clearly there is nothing scandalous, nothing militant, nothing political in these recommendations; their only fault, in fact, is that they have all been said before.

Fr. Arrupe points out that such a group apostolate would come under the direction of the Pope. Here again, he is referring to general directives for all Catholics: it is proper that the impetus should derive from the center of the Church and from its head. Certainly Fr. Arrupe does not mean that the Pope can concern himself with the details of administration. When he says that the Pope would assign to each his proper task, the reference is not to individuals but to organizations, to universities, to lay movements, and religious orders; in virtue of the Council's much-discussed principle of subsidiarity, the Pope could commission each of these groups to

specialize in a specific field of research or a definite type of activity.

Some have been surprised at what appears to be a return to centralization at a time when the Pope himself is directing a movement aimed at decentralization within the Church. Others are astonished to note that Fr. Arrupe devotes only one sentence to the role of the bishops in this group apostolate. Fr. Arrupe, I feel sure, is himself amazed at this reaction. He explicitly said that the group apostolate would receive its impetus from the Pope and develop "under the leadership of the pastors whom the Holy Spirit has established to rule the Church of God." The remark undoubtedly was too brief to satisfy the mood of the Council and the spirit of collegiality, but the essential point was made. Indeed, in the atmosphere hallowed by the formation of a permanent episcopal synod close to the Pope, the directives communicated by the Pope to the universal Church are conceived and implemented within the framework of a continuing dialogue between the head of the episcopal college and the entire episcopacy. On the other hand, we can scarcely discount a whole collection of factors which are making themselves felt more and more in the life of the Church: the formation of a unified position by the bishops of each country, the pressing need for a coordinated apostolate for specific areas, and the approval by the Council of national assemblies of bishops. These developments are still in the inchoative stage, but they respond to the needs of the Church in an increasingly unified world. In this context, it is evident that Fr. Arrupe feels that if his recommendations for a group apostolate were put into effect, it would be up to the bishops of each nation to apply them freely in accordance with the widely different conditions of each country and region.

THE GENERAL'S LOT

an interview with Fr. Arrupe

PETER HEBBLETHWAITE, S.J.

READERS OF THE *Tablet* MAY WELL FEEL that they have heard quite enough about Fr. Pedro Arrupe: his interventions have been widely reported and heatedly discussed; extracts from his press interviews have found their way into these pages. Yet it seemed to those who are beginning to know him that something was missing. The personality of the man was not coming through in his reported words. Accordingly, I asked Fr. Arrupe to give me an interview and to be allowed to write a candid article. Characteristically he said yes. The suspicion that a Jesuit cannot write honestly about his General is hard to dispel, but a start has to be made somewhere.

The difficulty is that, although a new situation has arisen, the old defensive and apologetic reflexes continue to operate. Previous Jesuit generals confined themselves to writing austere letters to their subjects: they did not make speeches, did not hold press conferences, were not accessible to journalists. In consequence, they led quieter lives. Fr. Arrupe, who is setting off for Africa now the Council is over, clearly does not intend to lead a quiet life, and he has broken most of the conventions—very much in the disconcerting way Pope John did. He talks. But he would have liked to distinguish between speaking as General and speaking in his own name: "The Society has

© Tablet (219, No. 6552 [December 18, 1965] 1411–13). Reprinted with permission.

no official voice in the Council. The voice which set a thousand pens writing was therefore my own: one among two thousand voices" (*Der Spiegel*, October 25th).

However, as he explained to me, the distinction is hard to apply, and he has discovered that it is now extremely difficult for him to speak in his own name: "Pedro Arrupe can't say anything any more," he said wryly. But he did not wish to "bind" anyone by what he said. He has learned that he will have to be more careful in the future and that what he says echoes round the world, even if addressed to a particular part of it.

He does not receive people sitting at his desk, and there is no biretta in sight. In the corner of his room are four armchairs round a coffee-table. He answers questions with great frankness and simplicity in an English that is effective and sometimes quaint: "Ha, did I make another *gaffe*?" Fr. Arrupe believes that a Jesuit house should be open and welcoming, a real community of hard work and charity. Community-spirit, at every level, is one of his constant themes. The intervention of September 27th ended with a plea for "fraternal charity and community spirit, which make us all brothers working together in Christ." Those English-speaking journalists who were present at the evening concelebration on November 4th when the General presided, will know that this is not an empty theory for him. And during the General Congregation there were frequent concelebrations, assistancy by assistancy. Twenty years ago Jesuit liturgy was reverent theatre when it was not a joke. Fr. Arrupe has found in the new liturgy a chance to express some of his deepest convictions; and what the community, gathered round the altar, is before God, it must become more and more before men.

But there is not just a new atmosphere: there is a new Arrupe style. The General Congregation endowed him with four more immediate advisors. Previously the General was aided by eleven assistants, each responsible for a geographical area and, as a result, not a specialist. The four new assistants—an American, a Canadian, a Hungarian and an Italian—will form an inner cabinet as well as being responsible for certain particular types of work. Readiness to seek advice is one of Fr. Arrupe's characteristics: for example, the Jesuit *periti* have been asked for their suggestions for the second part of the General Congregation. I asked him what his own hopes

were for the General Congregation, and he said: "The renewal of spiritual life and the implementation of the conciliar decrees." He is also sympathetic to young Jesuits: "Their needs, wishes and mentality are the voice of the modern world—in the good sense—in the Society."

These are not the views of a benighted diehard. But from that one cannot conclude that he is an ultraprogressive—it would no doubt be highly dangerous if he were. The labels simply do not fit a man with so complex a background. I asked him whether returning to Europe after so many years had been a handicap or a help: "It is both," he said. He admitted a certain handicap, above all when it came to intellectual developments, and added: "I need advice." On the other hand, he thinks that his years in the east have given him a sense of the universality of the Church and a "more complete view of humanity," both of which have been reinforced by his conciliar experience. In his second press conference he sketched out—no one seems to have noticed it—the grandiose vision of a "symbiosis" between east and west which, in its sweep and scope, was reminiscent of Teilhard de Chardin whom, with nuances, he had commended in his first press conference.

It is impossible to duck the question of atheism. It is here, we are told, that Fr. Arrupe revealed his true crusading colours and his dark suspicions about the modern world. Fr. Arrupe has not accused anyone of misreporting him, and he has conceded that his expression was "faulty." But his first intervention would have been better understood if it had been seen in the light of previous statements. For this was not the first time he had spoken of atheism. In the June 14th press conference he said: "We must, for pastoral reasons, try to penetrate the mind of the modern atheist, and look for the motives of his confusions and denials. They will prove to be manifold and complex." He added that three reactions were possible: the ghetto mentality or withdrawal into the sacristy; the anathema mentality which greets atheism with condemnations and fulminations; and the dialogal mentality which, following Pope Paul in *Ecclesiam Suam,* he recommended. If previous statments would have thrown light on the intervention of September 27th, subsequent statements should have removed all possibility of confusion. Fr. Arrupe explained himself in the *Spiegel* interview. The intervention had been designed

to stress that atheism was not just a theoretical problem but a practical one: atheism is not just something to talk about, but something to be replied to by living faith. There was never any question of a crusade or a counter-conspiracy, since only methods in conformity with the Gospel may be used: "Our strongest weapon is living faith; and faith shows its living quality in the will to truth, freedom and fraternity." And such an attitude is already dialogue, "existential dialogue." Dialogue is an overworked word and one not without ambiguity: some specialists in dialogue excel in monologues, and not everyone who cries "Dialogue, dialogue" will enter into its kingdom. However, this does not mean that dialogue in the sense of "sitting round a table to discuss" is excluded: that will depend on conditions of time and place; and on this matter, added Fr. Arrupe, "different opinions are possible—even among Jesuits."

If atheism has "manifold and complex motives," it is unfair to Fr. Arrupe to suggest that he will become the darling of the lunatic fringe by upholding, exclusively, the "conspiracy theory" of atheism. He does not. On the other hand there is a curious naïveté in those who deny all the evidence of an "organised atheistic group" which has a well-known theory and praxis. Everyone knows who is meant by this. I suppose the objection to the conspiracy theory is that it makes things too easy, that it seems to absolve its holder from any responsibility or involvement: it seems to let him out, and he doesn't have to consider atheism as a question addressed to himself. Such an objection would hold only if the speaker were explaining the phenomenon of atheism exclusively by the conspiracy theory. Which is not the case. "It has manifold and complex motives." And some sociological research—stage one of the famous "plan"—will not come amiss.

The "practical atheist" was another cause of misunderstanding. I have never heard a native English speaker talk about a "practical atheist," but if I did, I would think that he meant either "an atheist who is good with his hands, can mend fuses, do odd jobs" or else "a consequential atheist," that is, one who lives according to his atheistic principles. But those who speak the Romance languages use the term differently, and it has a precise sense: it means someone who lives as though God did not matter for him. He may call himself a Christian, but his faith is not a living faith, because it makes

no difference to his choices or way of life. Now it was this sort of "practical atheism" which Fr. Arrupe thought could creep into the Church; and anyone who doubts the possibility knows little about the human heart or the ecclesiastical world. Fr. Arrupe was not talking about crypto-Communists donning the soutane and infiltrating the Church (though this has happened in China and Czechoslovakia), but about a faith which has become abstract and ineffective, notional, not realised. One of the aims of conciliar renewal is that faith should be alive and adult and should extend into every domain of human experience. Living faith is the answer to "practical atheism," and Fr. Arrupe meant nothing more sinister than that.

Like his fellow Basque, St. Ignatius of Loyola, Fr. Arrupe is a man of ideals rather than ideas. His book of Japanese memories, *Este Japon Increible*, illustrates some of them: his great love and understanding of the people he was sent to, his powers of adaptation and resourcefulness, his readiness to discern the grace of God wherever it is. These qualities will now have wider scope. His reluctance to take himself over-seriously may have got him into difficulties, but he has the grace of humour: "I see our names have been linked," he said to a Jesuit alleged to have criticised him publicly. The meeting took place by accident, in a lift. For someone who is supposed not to like criticism, he can take it with rare humility. "That proves," said Frederick Franck, the artist, "what I learned from drawing him: he is a fine-boned spirit." Clearly, meeting people, like eating people, is wrong: it makes for understanding.

THE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL: AN EVALUATION

Edited by KENNETH DELUCA, S.J.

In early January of this year, a group of Jesuit educators representing thirteen countries gathered in Madrid to discuss the educational apostolate of the Society. From the minutes of their meeting came the following statement:

For every country in the world, no matter what its level of development, its political regime or its ideology, the schooling of its children is the number one human problem. More than ever before, the school is assuming the role of systematically initiating children, all children, into an understanding of the world, of man and of life; it is becoming the indispensable ladder to promotion and a successful future.

For evidence of this we need only note the enormous budgets devoted by states to national education, the considerable energies exerted by the various bodies of UNESCO, and the jealous hold kept by totalitarian governments on their monopoly of education. (In Communist countries, even when the Church is allowed other spiritual activities, she is strictly barred from any regular educational work in schools.)

If the Society wishes to be an effective presence in the modern world, she too, more than ever before, must take to heart her traditional task of education, and integrate it into the movement of contemporary society, according to the circumstances of time and place.

It is because we agree wholeheartedly with the above declaration that WOODSTOCK LETTERS *presents this Evaluation of the Jesuit High School. A second, and more immediate, reason is the JEA Workshop on the Christian Formation of High School Students scheduled to meet in Los Angeles this summer. It is our hope that the following*

papers and comments, exploring various aspects of our high school apostolate from a diversity of viewpoints and educational experience, will not only bring into relief certain areas of concern and challenge that face our schools today, but will also point the way to some possible solutions and greater excellence of achievement—to "effective presence in the modern world."

Fr. Michael P. Kammer, whose incisive and provocative essay introduces our Evaluation, teaches English and Latin at Jesuit High School, Shreveport. Fr. Feeney and Messrs. DeLuca, Gleeson, and Kerr are all theologians with teaching experience in one or more of our high schools.

The Theologate Reports section represents a compilation of what seemed most interesting and valuable in the reports prepared by the various theologates for the Los Angeles meeting. For the sake of easier synthesis, the general outline of workshop topics has been followed, although many theologians expressed serious reservations about its adequacy (this becomes clear on reading through the Evaluation). For their help in gathering the reports, thanks are due Lawrence Jones (Woodstock), Leo Lackamp (Bellarmine), Joseph Devlin (Weston), Gustavo Fernandez (Alma), and all who worked with them in committee.

The theologians' viewpoint is taken up again in Additional Comments by Fr. Mattimoe and Messrs. Lackamp and Hussey. Other observations come from those presently engaged in high school work. Discussing their respective religion programs are Fr. James DiGiacomo and Fr. John R. Welsh, both chairmen of the religion departments at Brooklyn Prep and Jesuit High School, Shreveport. An interesting diversity of views on the aims and direction of our high school apostolate are voiced by Fr. John W. Kelly, Headmaster of Brooklyn Prep, and by two other priests presently engaged in high school work.

Finally, rounding out our Evaluation are the reviews of three recent books on the adolescent by Fr. R. K. Judge and Mr. C. Donnelly, both theologians with some experience in counseling.

In order to continue a candid, open-end discussion of the Society's work in secondary education, we would welcome responses to this Evaluation of the Jesuit High School from our readers.

SUBVERSIVE TEACHERS

Michael P. Kammer, S.J.

we can no longer go on pretending that,
because we call it a rose, it smells like a rose

I should like to say that I was led to read Edgar Z. Friedenberg's *Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence** because Shreveport, Louisiana, is our home town—his by birth, mine by assignment. But the truth is that I read it because I was asked to comment on it. I generally avoid the reading of useful books in order to spend my time on literature and trash. I like to eat my dead steer in the form of steak, I like grain in the form of Scotch; and so I like my philosophy, theology, and psychology in the form of fiction or, at least, dressed in style.

Friedenberg's book is largely in Sociologish and, if he has a style, he hasn't let it affect his writing. He does share one fine thing with all great writers except Milton and Spenser: a precise irony capable of slicing away diseased tissue without destroying the healthy cells around it.

A book such as Friedenberg's must automatically commit one of the sins it most deplores: it studies man in the mass. The humanities —trashy or otherwise—study him alive, under glass, not in large faceless lumps. I had rather read C. P. Snow, who makes many of the same points that Friedenberg does—though Snow himself comes uncomfortably close to merely fictionalizing social studies.

I am no social scientist. (I have an M.A. in English that dates from the days when St. Louis University kept its graduates busy

* New York: Random House, 1965. Pp. 300. $5.95.

copying samples of Round Irish and Gothic majuscule and minuscule, and carefully shielded them from any brush with literature.) But, unless I'm wildly wrong, Friedenberg's research and his own cavalier use and then discard of it is one of the funniest things I've seen in my meager acquaintance with educational literature, and a happy index to his own esteem for mathematical assessment of people and the condition of their minds.

For his interviews with students he sets up a series of wonderfully complicated stories about a mythical Le Moyen High School (pun in French intended, I feel sure) and had his clients grade some remarkable responses to the situations the stories described. Most of the responses were remarkable because they, too, were so complicated as to bemuse any poor mortal used only to problems thrown up by mere life. The stories and the responses he offers for choice are reminiscent of the old moral books (they may still be the only "moral books") once studied in theology, which would state the case of, say, poor Christina, who, while living in concubinage with the pastor for whom she keeps house, is faced with the problem of feeding a beggar of unknown religious profession at the back door on a Friday with the chop that she has stolen as intended occult compensation from the only butcher shop in town. (Query 1: Must she feed the beggar, and, if so, only in charity or under strict obligation of justice?) As one of the students told Friedenberg of one of the stories, "This is a regular soap opera."

Needles in the mind

None of this criticism alters the fact that Friedenberg has a great deal to say that is worth reading and that he makes his points in such fashion that they stick like needles in the mind. He is much too bright, too honest, and too impatient with triviality to worry for long about the research or reporting it. He seems to have conducted the research as a gimmick to get the students he interviewed to talk about themselves, their schools, and their attitudes and the schools', and he seems to have written one third of the book to satisfy the conditions of a foundation grant. The rest is straight Friedenberg and full of the valuable insight of a perceptive, honest, passionate man who knows the high-school educational slum and is pregnant and ill with vision of the homes that should rise in its place. You gotta

know the territory, and Friedenberg knows the high schools, public and private, the way a rat knows his city dump.

Like most effective crusaders against human degradation, he offers no new information about the muck in which we are threshing about —he merely calls it sharply by name so that we can no longer go on pretending that, because we call it a rose, it smells like a rose. And like any other sensible crusader, he offers no really new solutions, since the solutions are implicit in the problems, once we have told our stupid nose the name of what it is smelling. It is as if he were saying—

> I am no orator, as Conant is,
> But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man
> That love the mind. . . . I only speak right on;
> I tell you that which you yourselves do know,
> Show you dear learning's wounds, poor, poor, dumb mouths,
> And bid them speak for me.

Among the charges he makes, I should like to select two or three for further remark and for application to Jesuit high schools (for this is not intended as a review of Friedenberg's book but as a response to it).

He considers the high school one of the last vestiges of colonialism in America, an institution similar to Federal prisons without walls, like the one at Seagoville, Texas, encouraged and supported by the state as a somewhat unpleasant compound in which the student is systematically deprived of any goal for the mind that would prove disturbing to the society in which he is expected to take his place later on. Friedenberg's description of that society lacks definition, but I think it would be fair to say that he sees it as a place inimical to speculation, though the humanities are enshrined there in mummy cases and the names of the great priests are memorized (like: "Shakespeare, a great poet of man's probings of himself, who wrote more than thirty plays, of which I have sampled *The Merchant of Venice* and *Macbeth*—and *Hamlet*, of course, in quotation.") He states that it is a place ruled by the Protestant ethic, in which one is supposed to *make something of himself* and *get things done.*

To provide an atmosphere in the high school deadly to unwanted speculation, society makes sure that the teachers who teach there are a seedy lot intellectually, a great deal of whose time is given to

procedural business of the sort handled by unthinking clerks in better-run commercial enterprises, and to menial tasks (corridor and cafeteria prefecting, etc.) that would lower the prestige of the retired cops who manage children at school crossings. (I once heard a principal say he was giving a teacher a prefecting assignment lest the latter get too big for his britches. The same official made *all* teachers sit through the boredom of student assemblies devoted chiefly to his own drone.)

Vulgarians

By various devices, like low salaries, the public school recruits its teachers from among vulgarians (cultural, not social) with no respect except for achievement and with a mortal unease in the face of interesting and rich failure, with no comprehension of knowledge-as-its-own-end or of a person in himself as well as in his relationship to the common good. It seems to me that the Jesuit order in the United States uses a different but no less effective device: It recruits its personnel from among the unspeculative achievers and then, without ever exactly saying so, by looks, by a stiffening of the body, by the smiling question "But where do you get the *time*?" it inhibits the pursuit of, and delight in, the humanities during philosophy, high-school regency, and theology, and makes the Jesuit who indulges in them feel guilty about the waste of time and energy. True, samples of the humanities are *studied* in the juniorate; but the samples are treated as samples; and *study* (at least with the implications it seems to have for many Jesuits—analysis of the way the form was produced rather than intercourse with the organic work, an intercourse full of tender and violent curiosity, probings, and satisfactions, full of union with the very life of the work) is the surest way to kill a humanistic creation and to teach the young to plug their minds against its musty corpse.

I know that, historically, the Society is considered a great promoter of the humanities. I sometimes wonder whether that was *all* she really was—a promoter—like the book salesman who doesn't read the books he sells. I know so little about the matter that I have no warrant for such a charge. But I would like to ask a good historian of literature how it happened that so little of the Society's contribution to humanism is in the form of literature, how it happened

that so little of what she had to say was creative in its insight into human nature, or treated man alive rather than as a case, a type, a problem, a category, an object of various purposes, always good. I would like to ask him why Jesuit teachers of the classics are so often readers of nothing else, except perhaps the newspaper and a magazine or two. If a man is having intercourse with the classics, it seems that that should make him promiscuous. It would seem strange to me if the sight of the Parthenon would beget a love of only the Parthenon; I would expect it to send one on to Rheims and Coventry, and not for sneering. Why are so few scholastics compulsive readers of literature and trash—for trash is often only a poor relation of literature, with a lot of the same blood in its veins. I should like to ask him how a humanistic Jesuit order in the United States ever came to accept the incredible notion, implicit in much public education, that the checkout clerk in a grocery store has no need to torture himself with Graham Greene, that the clerk is alien to Scobie or Othello, that the clerk does not have as much need of words as the next man to say his own torture to himself.

The basic need—metanoia

Friedenberg offers the obvious solutions. He doesn't offer any means, however, except for one rather interesting teacher-student set-up. The basic need, of course, is for a metanoia; Friedenberg's book is useful here, since most conversions spring at least in part from disgust with one's former way of life. He quite properly stimulates such disgust.

But I should like to suggest a solution for us Jesuits (safely and irresponsibly, since it will not be taken). I should like to suggest that the teachers chosen to educate our scholastics in houses of study should be, five to one, men who speak well and present their subject in a way that is not an affront to all the soul's faculties for delight. At present, the teacher who teaches Ours in the philosophate and theologate is generally a rather narrow, inarticulate person, a mere specialist, frightened, eccentric, almost proud of his poor presentation —as if truth should be stark and cold and not merely gloriously naked. The other one (of the five to one), the inarticulate but highly valuable expert, should be available to help the scholastic in research and with expert advice. I base this suggestion on the notion that the

man who can make a good presentation, who speaks well, who can make his audience react with more than boredom or rebellion is a humanist, an artist working with humanity, and his art is the thing most likely in the world to beget in the scholastics a thirst for the fulness of life in this world. Is there anything in the treatise on ontology that requires that the teacher be a poor speaker, alien to the *delight* of being, fearful of the bright young men seated in front of him, and complete with spastic mannerisms? Is Plato less for writing well? Would the world be richer if Socrates had spoken badly, if he had not charmed his young hearers to a view of the universe and a delight in their own being, no matter what he was discussing at the moment? Is it a *blessing* that what we have of Aristotle is without style?

Poetry required of all

I suggest that, when a concept has reached such definition that it can be adequately expressed in jargon, it can then be taught by a machine. I suggest that the only reason that a teacher should be a person is that he should encourage speculation and lead it. I suggest that to tell another man about an unknown and very different country requires a medium, a metaphor in which the known and unknown can meet, each taking meaning from the other, and that such a medium is the essence of poetry. I suggest that poetry is required of all teachers, of teachers of philosophy, of theology, of psychology (witness Freud's creative names for human aberrations and problems, names without which he could never have caught the interest of the public and changed the world). And I think that a man taught by a poet of philosophy or theology (with the dry, inarticulate expert in the background for the poet and the student to measure themselves against in a sort of ascetical exercise to keep the mind lean) will come to be himself a humanist, a reader, a man of intellectual and emotional delight, ready for a kind of intimacy with his high-school students' souls which will breed not contempt, but freedom of mind, a way out of the slavery of mere accommodation to society.

In short, I see no reason why the Society of Jesus should not demand a measure of eloquence of the scholars who will teach its own men; for eloquence, if it is real, consists of saying more than one thing at a time, of affirming the good delights of this rich garden

in which God has placed man. Anything less is unworthy of man's patrimony, his ancestry, and his destiny. We are, at least in Christ, aristocrats, with no right to cultural vulgarity.

I see no other alternative to the plight of the scholastic who said to me last month, "I have to teach poetry next quarter. I haven't read much of it and don't really know what it is; can you help me?" Or to the plight of his students. He did not know what he was asking. That may be the worst of his condition, and of theirs.

TOWARD HONEST REAPPRAISAL

KENNETH DELUCA, S.J.
THOMAS GLEESON, S.J.

what our schools need is more
creative disturbance from below

"HOW DO WE FORM CHRISTIANS TODAY?" In mid-August Jesuits representing all phases of secondary education in this country will gather in Los Angeles to reflect on this question. Had they come together only ten years ago, the question might well have been, "How do we form Christian leaders?" Ten short years have forced us back to fundamentals.

In this same spirit of exploring what is most basic, and prompted by Father General's recent letter on our high school apostolate to the fathers of the French Assistancy,[1] we turn our attention to four areas of consideration; curriculum-content, educational mentality, ourselves as educators, and the environments we face or create in educating young men today—the age-old questions of what, how, whom, and where. Hopefully, the questions we raise will be of some service to those Jesuits interested in high school education.

Curriculum-content

In the area of curriculum-content the problem is principally one of educational philosophy—specifically, the relation between edu-

[1] A translation of the letter appears in *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 28 (1965) 69–74.

cational goals and means. Aside from any question of up-to-date methodology, we might well examine both the subjects that we are presently teaching, and, even more importantly, their place in the total curriculum development. Are these subjects really introducing the student to all the various knowing experiences he might hope to gain from his high school education, and are they doing so in a way that is relevant to the contemporary teenager? Do we make the necessary connections for him, in and through our teaching, between educational goals and subjects taught? Have we clearly articulated for *ourselves* what these connections are?[2]

To be more specific: does it make a difference to our objectives whether we teach four years of modern language or two, or three years of science or one, or whether we take the social sciences seriously at all? And if the classics truly deserve all the attention they have traditionally received, why honor Latin over the clearly superior Greek? And do we really have a reason for either? If these questions do indeed make a difference, it is not an easy one to discern at present. Decisions concerning curriculum-content too frequently seem the result of a patchwork expediency, and growth by accretion in this manner is hardly the best way of organizing one's curriculum.

If we are truly to be professional, a constant re-examination is needed of the relation between educational goals and the means which best achieve them. How else, as Father General suggests, are we to help our students "understand the aspirations which are today forcing themselves to the surface as part of the current cultural evolution, instructing them in a timely way to discern true values"?[3] And certainly the practice of attaching a few periods of *x* and *z* to the older weekly diet, often simply to avoid educational embarrassment, is difficult to reconcile with a position of leadership in secondary education.

As another example of this problematic relation between goals and means, it is interesting to note that the 1966 Workshop "accepts (with necessary modification) as the working description of the ideal of the modern Jesuit high school graduate the 'Profile of the

[2] For a more extensive development of these ideas, see Philip H. Phenix, *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[3] *Loc. cit.*, p. 72.

Jesuit College Graduate' proposed by the 1962 Los Angeles Workshop" (one similar to this summer's, but concerned with higher education).

We read in this profile that the Jesuit graduate "should be decisive in confronting life, courageous and hopeful in exercising initiative, yet loyal to legitimate authority." This will demand, we are told, "a positive-minded patience that is neither passivity nor abandonment of ideals." Our ideal graduate "will be personally dedicated to Christ and generously committed to creative involvement and leadership in the intellectual, social, cultural, religious life of his world."[4] We have quoted only excerpts, but enough we think to make one gasp a little, and hope that somewhere, someone is accomplishing all of this.

Our point here is not to find fault with the profile itself; indeed it is quite well put. But we do wish to question its relevance to actuality. Have we seriously (with a view to *action*) asked if *what* we are teaching has anything at all to do with the goals we profess? If the answer is to be Yes, then let us spell out the connections quite clearly; if No, then let us be equally clear on how these objectives are to be gained. But let us not continue to weave a patch-quilt curriculum. Let us have reasons.

Mentality

The question of educational mentality invites discussion of a typically Jesuit pitfall—our overly-deductive, a priori approach to things. Though at times unwittingly, we generally *start* with all the ideals, norms, profiles, and curricula. At worst this can result in a not infrequent disregard for the "given" in the educational experience, the student. What is *his* way of seeing things, *his* needs, *his* likes, *his* hopes and dreams? What are the complex influences that create *his* world? As we were reminded many years ago, man was not made for the sabbath. The same, we would hope, is true of students and schools.

It is gratifying to see in this regard that the Los Angeles Workshop sets as its first major objective: "To study the modern adolescent in

[4] From the *Minutes of the First Meeting of the Planning Committee* for the 1966 Workshop (mimeographed), pp. 3–4. The meeting was held at the University of Detroit High School on September 1–2, 1964.

the Jesuit high school today: his attitudes and the forces in the modern world which shape those attitudes."[5] In fact the first two topics for consideration are "The Adolescent in the World Today," and "The Adolescent in the Jesuit High School." This is to start with what is most important in our schools, the student.

The second major objective is "To study the ideal of Jesuit secondary education in the concrete: What are the characteristics of the educated Christian person whom Jesuit education aims to produce?" Perhaps this is a worthwhile pursuit. One suspects, however, that any administrator or teacher in our high schools who is worth his weight (and salary) knows intuitively that profiles of the *typical* "educated Christian person" are beside the point. What *is* important for the educator is that this particular student has his own individual goals to be realized.

The Workshop's final major objective is "To examine the traditional means used in Jesuit education for the Christian formation of students, and to offer recommendations and suggestions for adapting the traditional means to meet the needs of the student in today's Jesuit secondary schools." The deductive mentality talked of above is quite clearly at work here. It is the "*traditional* means" that will be examined for possible adaptation. The guidelines are already set; a frame of mind is already cast. We can only hope that this "adapting" will allow a genuinely honest reappraisal of things "traditional," even if this means fundamental and radical change. As Father General urges, we must "make our schools ever more adapted to a world which is being constructed and put together under our very eyes." Not only does our role as educators prevent us "from being satisfied with methods that were considered excellent in former times; quite the contrary, our role forces us to adjust ourselves to the actual evolution of academic and educational structures, and to be constantly searching in order to show ourselves, prudently but realistically, faithful to the mentality of our generation, *even if we must put aside some of our cherished convictions.*" We must be "ready for all innovations, *even the most radical,*" so as to preserve for our schools their full "apostolic effectiveness."[6]

In the light of Father General's observations, it is important that

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[6] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 70–71 (emphasis added).

the awareness gained from a study of the workshop's first objective—the modern adolescent in the Jesuit high school today—be the guiding and determining factor of all else that follows. We simply note here that all the workshop papers will have been prepared in obvious isolation from these crucial findings. This is not to imply that the papers will not be highly competent and relevant to today's teenager, and hence to today's problems; but if they are, it will not be due to the workshop's structurally deductive bias.

Our purpose here has not been to deny the obvious value and need for this summer's workshop. We do believe, however, that a mentality which is not altogether healthy hovers over much of our educational thinking and activity. There is much too little of the inductive and experiential, and we suggest that the very format of the Los Angeles Workshop is no exception. Indeed the very word "formation" implies much that is unhappy in light of our past experience as Jesuits.

Two further, and related, ramifications of this a priori mentality deserve mention: the lack of controlled experimentation in Jesuit high schools, and the emphasis on imposition of matter in our teaching. First, the question of experimentation. Since the scare of Sputnik a decade ago, American secondary education has undergone a period of almost total reassessment. And yet have Jesuit educators really paid much more than lip service to the many new ideas about curriculum planning, for example, or teaching techniques, or expanded use of growing community resources? Where it is needed most—in this area of the experimental—official encouragement and imprimatur come painfully slow.

Perhaps this is due to our province and assistancy programs which, though valuable in other ways, have tended to idealize and perpetuate a needless uniformity. Perhaps, too, it is because experimentation that is intelligent and truly productive is quite difficult when one simply doesn't know the *what* or *how* of it. Even our implementation of the Advanced Placement Program, one of the few "new" educational developments that Jesuit high schools seem to be taking seriously, appears unadventurous when compared with others'.[7] Nor should we be surprised at this. For until we include

[7] See Robert R. Newton, S.J., "Self-Renewal in Jesuit High Schools," *Woodstock Letters* 95 (1966) 86ff.

experimentation and careful follow-up analysis as part of our ordinary procedure, and begin to urge teacher-training for participation in such programs, we will forever be dependent on the imagination and inventiveness of others.

It might be valuable to reflect on our own Jesuit training, and ask if it has provided any real incentive for such experimentation? Have we not generally been overcautious in weighing every contingency and risk before venturesome decisions are made? Have we not so institutionalized the safe and tested way that genuine progress has become at times the herculean task it was never intended to be? We suggest that what is needed is much more creative thinking such as contributed to the Inter-Faculty Progress Inquiry at Rockhurst College last November about our course of studies in theology. A fresh and invigorating vision was created at Rockhurst. Surely we cannot presume that our high school structures are somehow more immune from the rush of time than are those of our theologates.

Secondly, there is the question of imposition of matter. Knowledge too often comes prepackaged in our schools. It is the teacher who has the answers—and even the questions that prompt them—and these he communicates to his students for absorption, memorization, and recall at the appropriate testing time. Active student participation is a byword of Jesuit educational theory, but do our educational structures really allow for it, except on the teacher's terms? Do we encourage in our schools an atmosphere that is initiative-oriented, one where creativity can truly flourish, or have we decreed a type of learning that almost outlaws individual search?

What our schools need is more creative disturbance from below. It is the students who should be pressuring *us* to lead them down ever more demanding paths rather than we forcing them to toe any fixed and overly-rigid line. How do we "institutionalize" the radical; how do we make room for the poet, the truly creative soul? Do we offer him more than boredom, and even, on occasion, suffocation? Admittedly, these are hard questions, but they cry out urgently for answers.

This is not to suggest an educational philosophy of "student-knows-best," but it *is* to suggest that the individual student is the starting and finishing point of our teaching endeavor. If *he* isn't reached, then in a true sense we have failed. And given the generally

high caliber of student one finds in our schools, shouldn't we be less prone to find fault with him, and more eager for honest self-reflection? Isn't it possible that the "body of matter" approach to learning has triggered many a problem of student apathy and ennui?

The parallel between this matter-imposition in our schools and the thesis mentality in our own course of studies is uncomfortably close. It is not strange that we should find this essentially uncreative learning process in our high school classrooms; it is the rare person who can transcend his own upbringing. Certainly, students—even Jesuit students—must be *told* things, but can they be expected to listen very long or very carefully if the learning process ceases to be a challenge—if no teacher ever strikes sparks of desire? Fortunately, the old adage, "like father, like son," has some real truth in it. And one hopes that the growing renewal of our Jesuit training program will soon reap its harvest in the high school.

Ourselves as educators

Curricula and educational procedures necessarily imply the right person to give them life. It is only through the individual educator that any effective influence can be exercised on the high school student. But what are the specific demands made on the man? What qualities must he embody? Today's teenager can readily provide us with some answers.

First, he will ask that the Jesuit really *want* to be involved in educating him. In a word, he will ask for commitment. Such apostolic involvement seems like a simple request, but how many Jesuits now teaching in high schools are truly committed to this work? A reply to such a question is sobering, and immediately raises a deeper one: why *are* there so few? Commitment is a shorthand way of saying many things—desire, involvement, generosity, loyalty, and any number of other words. Allowing for diversity among individual temperaments, we might ask ourselves how often desire, in the sense of individual initiative or even healthy ambition, is present in our Jesuit commitment? How often is it thought to be genuinely good and necessary? How often are we encouraged to exercise personal initiative and ambition in our total formation as Jesuits?

Present renewal within the Church offers a concrete challenge to our contemporary commitment in secondary education. As Father

General reminds us, our schools should be "open first of all to the changes in the Church and its quest, in such fashion that the fathers may be unceasingly attentive to transmit in their teaching and in their methods of education everything that will allow their students to assimilate, in all its vigor, the vitality of a Church in change."[8] We wonder how many Jesuits really share this Ignatian vision? Certainly openness to change should be a characteristic virtue of the Society. Here again a look at certain aspects of our formation—spiritual, psychological, and intellectual—might be illuminating: our highly systematic and individualized mental prayer, our stumbling relationships with one another in quasi-community, our creation of self-contained educational structures.

As a second demand, today's teenager will ask competence of his educators, administrators as well as faculty. First of all, academic competence. The assertion of American pragmatism over the past decade in such areas as space exploration and computer technology has created a new and demanding environment for today's youth. They have been conditioned to an efficient excellence. Father General's observation is quite apropos here: "The standard of the total formation, and in particular that of the academic aspect, ought to be such that the students find themselves constantly stimulated toward a higher ideal and toward a more serious approach to their work."[9] This is what today's teenager demands of his education—a balance of relevance, efficiency, and excellence. And this is what we must be prepared to give him.

But our preparation involves more than classical background and academic or professional specialization. It involves awareness and foreknowledge of the teenager with whom we are to deal. It involves constant utilization of adolescent psychology and real knowledge of the milieu from which the teenager comes to us. We must be open "without any fear to the psychological, cultural, and social transformations which are being brought about today at an accelerated pace."[10] Academic ability is only one of the many competencies demanded of today's Jesuit in the high school apostolate.

A final requirement is implicit in the preceding. The Jesuit in high school work today needs a continuing preparation. Simply stated, this amounts to a meaningful intellectual life—professional contacts,

[8] *Loc. cit.*, p. 71. [9] *Ibid.* [10] *Ibid.*

growth in his particular academic discipline, and increasing awareness of the students with whom he deals. Preparation doesn't cease with the tertianship.

Father General summarizes these demands when he asks that we "adjust ourselves to the actual evolution of academic and educational structures" and "strive in every way possible . . . that the formation which we give to our students may be as adapted as possible to the world in which, a little later on, they will have to carry on their activity as adults."[11] We must in all charity realize that many of our men are presently not equal to such a task, and that often re-education, or even reassignment, should be seriously considered.

Environments

The term *environment* perhaps best expresses the fourth area of our concern in the high school apostolate. We would like to focus briefly on three of these so-called environments; student mores, the school itself, and the school's attitude toward the surrounding community. With respect to the first of these, Father General concludes his letter by noting "how indispensable appears the effort you have undertaken to know better the sociological milieu of your students." He continues: "The conclusions of such inquiries can and ought to be very valuable for a better use of pedagogical methods, for a more enlightened orientation of the students, for a more efficacious apostolate toward their families, and finally for a more exact appreciation of the mentality and environment in which it will be necessary for you to live in complete approachability."[12]

The value of such a sensitivity to student environment is hard to overemphasize, and yet it is an attitude often difficult to find operative in ourselves and in our schools. Frequently, in abstracting the student from his socio-psychological surroundings, we seem to indulge in a kind of educational solipsism. Perhaps in the face of rapid change we have been too tenacious in clinging to what Father General labels our "cherished convictions." Yet it is difficult to see how men so thoroughly isolated from this rapidly changing milieu throughout their formative years can be expected to foster an "appreciation of the mentality and environment" in which they are to live "in complete approachability."[13]

---

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 71–2. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 73

[13] It is interesting to read in the recent *Minutes of the Congress on the*

In addition to the student's own milieu, the school provides another environment for him and his classmates—namely, the forces, attitudes, and customs which in large measure determine his school experience. Two specific elements in this vast area deserve special mention, the role of our lay teachers and the existing discipline structure—two factors which have a definite bearing, for better or worse, on the student's maturing in responsibility. Does he observe lay teachers, or even many Jesuits, exercising a determining influence on school affairs? How often does the prevailing discipline structure, often of the "cops and robbers" variety, provide the individual student with the freedom necessary to develop his own responsibility? Do we attempt to create an environment of trust and responsibility in the total school community? And might there be some relation here to the discipline structure that pervades our own Society?

A third milieu which in some way determines our students is the school's relation to the local community. Is it merely that of a select prep school for talented middle-class young men which thrives as an oasis in the blighted inner city? Or is there real involvement in the community, whether city or suburbia? As Father General asserts, "a school that wants to be faithful to the mind of St. Ignatius must play, in the area where it is located, a decisive role." Its very presence in the community must make a difference. For "we cannot, in fact, be faithful to our apostolic ideal unless we work for the *integral* formation of those youths who are entrusted to us, ensuring the steadfastness of their character, the rectitude of their judgment and their emotions, their aesthetic sense, their *community and social awareness*, etc."[14] To fail in this challenge is to fail not only our students but ourselves as well.

Educational Apostolate of the Society of Jesus (mimeographed), p. 11: "Every opportunity should be exploited (and if necessary created) for educating the young Jesuit to an active participation in non-Jesuit communities; for example, certain experiments outside the novitiate, the university community during his studies, the military community in those countries where seminarists are bound to military service, periods in factories or in parishes, etc. These experiences should be so many opportunities for forming the young Jesuit to live, as a true Jesuit, outside a totally Jesuit community." The Congress was held in Madrid, Spain, on January 7–12, 1966.

[14] *Loc cit.*, p. 70 (emphasis added).

Conclusion

In these pages we have attempted to explore four basic areas of educational concern: curriculum-content, educational mentality, ourselves as educators, and certain student-school environments. We realize that any article such as this—long on problems and noticeably short on answers—runs the risk of seeming overly negative and bleak. We sincerely hope that this has not been the case, for clearly there is much to be proud of in our high schools.

Our plea has been for more risk on all levels. Not foolishness, but true Christian openness; a real vote of confidence in the potentiality of our students to do great things when their interests and talents are creatively unleashed.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

JOSEPH J. FEENEY, S.J.

An experience and some reflections

COMMUNITY TODAY IS A PROBLEM for Christians. After a retreat college and high school groups plead the value of a communal Christian experience. Families wonder if they are truly united; religious ask if their own communities provide a real experience of living in a Christian community. People who have experienced such a community in Christ know what it is; others are unclear about both the experience and its meaning. The experience is, some think, rare and its meaning unclear; in any case the problem of Christian community is great.

Our Jesuit high schools share in this problem. Sometimes a community of our students simply does not exist; more often our students form various well-knit groups, but groups which are disputably Christian. From a reflection on our high schools two questions seem to arise: Is the experience of Christian community relevant to today's high school student? In terms of a Jesuit high school, what is the meaning of the phrase "Christian community"? The present paper hopes to treat these questions—one experiential and one conceptual—

by describing an experience of twenty-nine students living in community for six days and, after presenting this experience, by reflecting on its value and importance in terms of today's Jesuit high schools.

The experience

Georgetown Prep stands on a pleasant campus in suburban Washington. Twenty-nine high school boys and ten Jesuits from the Maryland Province met here last August for a six-day leadership institute.[1] The boys were chosen leaders from St. Joseph's Prep, Bishop's Latin, Loyola High, Gonzaga High, and Georgetown Prep; one of these schools, for example, sent its incoming student-council president, its sodality prefect, its newspaper editor, and three outstanding juniors. Most of the boys attending were sodalists, and the Institute was officially the "Institute of Sodality Leadership" (ISL); the group, however, hardly restricted its thinking and discussion to the sodality nor was the value of the sodality presumed. The ISL's very purpose reflected its wider scope, for it intended: to train leaders; to plan for sodality work during the coming year; and to question and evaluate the sodality as an effective structure and apostolic instrument in high school. From the beginning, too, the ISL strove to develop a Christian community through living and recreating together, through working and discussing together, and through the liturgy.

The ISL was structured to proceed from problems through leadership techniques to solutions; the problems were personal identity, social existence, race, poverty, and the relevance of God. To prepare the boys and Jesuits for the discussions, each person was expected to read six books before arriving at Georgetown Prep; hopefully each of the boys would also have had some prior apostolic experience. We planned to discuss (or hear a talk about) each of these problems and, in the last two days, to have the boys and Jesuits from each school meet together to discuss each problem in terms of their own school. Informality was to be a key factor both for the discussions and for developing a strong and closely united Christian community among the boys and Jesuits.

[1] A fuller account is available, "The Institute of Sodality Leadership: A Report," drawn up by George A. Aschenbrenner, S.J., John F. X. Burton, S.J., Patrick J. O'Brien, S.J., William J. Watters, S.J., and edited by the author. Most of the material in this section is adapted from this report.

We came together on the afternoon of August 15th, and during the first three days our basic problems—identity, social existence, race, poverty, and God—were presented and discussed; some speakers brought their own experience to us, for example, Miss Jane Hardin of Friendship House in Washington and Fr. Philip Berrigan, S.S.J., of St. Peter Claver parish in Baltimore. We saw a movie on *The Detached American* and on one night heard a panel of outstanding Christians from Washington on the relevance of the Christian life in the modern world; one man was an attorney, one the director of Children's Hospital, one a research biologist, one the chief psychiatrist for the Peace Corps, and in each case the boys and Jesuits were deeply impressed by these men. The fourth day treated the meaning of leadership and also provided a break and a tour of Washington. During the last two days our meetings were grouped according to our schools, and these meetings tried to determine the possible action of the school and the relevance of the sodality in each problem area.

The liturgy helped greatly to unify the ISL community, for each day twelve priests concelebrated the Eucharist with the highest possible participation by all present. The boys planned the liturgy, prepared the Prayer of the Faithful, read the Epistle, and led the offertory procession. The whole group recited the proper and sang hymns; these hymns were accompanied by a guitar and chosen from the *People's Mass Book*, from Fr. Rivers' *American Mass*, and from liturgical adaptations of four familiar folk melodies such as "Kumbaya" or "Michael, Row the Boat Ashore." The "Kumbaya" adaptation, for example, is as follows:

> Take our gifts, Lord, bread and wine.
> By your grace, Lord, consecrate.
> We give ourselves, Lord, mind and heart.
> By your love, Lord, make us one.
> We will love, Lord, as you loved.
> Give us peace, Lord, give us peace.
> We are praying, Lord, hear our prayer.

Mass was always offered facing the people, and on two occasions the concelebrants surrounded the altar with the boys and scholastics forming a tight circle behind them. The liturgy, by the boys' own evaluation, struck them as central to each day's activities and to the communal spirit of the ISL; well over half said the liturgy was the "event they got the most from" during the week. The ISL's liturgical

program also included two scripture services, one on the "Call to Leadership" and one on "Christian Response."

The overwhelming effect of the ISL, however, was the sense of community we developed during our days together. The stress of the Institute was on the experience of community living rather than on a theoretical explanation. All—boys and Jesuits—lived together on the same corridor; we ate and served table together, worked, discussed, swam, sang together. No rules were made or needed in the course of the week. Rather, Christ came as we talked about leadership in our lives and in our social surroundings, and Christ did not come to the community without leaving a deep effect. The boys were most impressed by, in their own words, "a spirit of Christian community," "learning Christian love and forgetting self," and by "the spirit of community in a successful group action"; one boy wrote that "our work was Christ-centered as demonstrated by our participation in the liturgy; it was Christ-centered in another way because we lived the Gospel by living in brotherhood and love as Christ commanded."

Many problems, of course, remained unsolved as a result of the ISL. One school, for example, was not sure what it would do with the sodality as it then existed in the school; this group has since abolished the old structure and started anew from a small community-like group. And the effect of the ISL in the everyday school situation is hard to calculate. But at least the *community* experience at Georgetown Prep remains unforgettable for the boys and for the Jesuits. Perhaps the previous comments fail to communicate this experience; hopefully the following personal evaluations,[2] written one month later by some of the boys, will express what one boy described as "our spirit, our desire for Christian solutions to problems, and our general feelings of joy in Christ."

I

"Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us" through our brothers in the community at Georgetown Prep. This is my reaction in retrospect to the ISL.

Initially, I was perplexed by the approach to leadership at Georgetown.

[2] These evaluations were drawn up through the kindness of Winslow J. Borkowski, Timothy T. Hughes, Stanley T. Kaleczyc, Richard F. Santore, Edward L. Selgrade, and Thomas P. Sutula.

What does Christian living have to do with leadership? The answer wasn't to come easily. It's only now, when I'm up at 12:30 writing this analysis and through a few weeks back at school, that I'm able to realize that leadership involves selfless respect and selfless service. Leadership and commitment seem acceptable enough to the enterprising layman. Leadership and respect, leadership and service, and even leadership and brotherhood ring harmoniously in the non-Christian mind. The key to real leadership is "selflessness"—selfless commitment, selfless respect, selfless service, and selfless brotherhood.

Georgetown has had a very ironic effect on my conception of selflessness. At Georgetown, there was no test for love. No matter how much you did, love was returned. Yet the most obvious effect on all those who participated was to eliminate any demand for reciprocal love. To want mutual love is natural, but to expect it is selfish. Somehow, after participating as recipients for a week in mutual love, we never came to expect it. I think this brings out the genuineness of the love which was started or, if you prefer, revitalized at Georgetown.

Two sentences can cover a great deal of what I realized at Georgetown. Although leadership is not necessarily Christian, Christianity necessarily implies leadership by its nature. Its nature is "selflessness" in a selfish world.

II

For me the ISL can best be described as the most thoroughly Christian experience I ever had. We were brought together as strangers with different views and interests and the one common goal of working for Christ. During the six days we attempted to discover how we should and would do Christ's work. In the process we developed into a community united by this aim.

The liturgy was the climax of our daily work. Every member of the community participated; no one merely observed. The community spirit seemed to me to be at its apex during the liturgy, for here I could see a group of people pouring themselves out for Christ and rejoicing in doing His work.

The human person of Christ was present in a very striking way at the ISL. It was almost as if He were there physically as a participant. The Christian love for each other was obvious in conversations, discussions, and in recreation in the pool and on the field. You could even see it in the boisterous 2 A.M. "bull-sessions." In these things you could see Him as a person working and recreating with us. He was a third person in our conversations, our work, and our fun.

III

To me, the most vivid impression which I retain of the ISL has been the unique community which we all experienced when we joined together in the celebration of the Eucharist. At this time, more than at any other period of the Institute, did I feel more of a oneness with the other sodalists. The entire format of the ISL was designed with this end in mind, and it succeeded in a manner and to a degree which I believe surprised the Jesuits, as

well as ourselves. But I had found that the atmosphere of the Institute was supercharged to an extent which is truly idealistic. For all of us, our subsequent return to our own environments proved to be an astounding shock. However, at the same time, the ISL has defined a goal for which each of us should personally aim, a goal which every sodalist must strive for in every sphere in which he exercises influence.

IV

Since the conclusion of the very successful 1965 ISL, I have asked myself many times, "Was it all a dream, an ideal state of existence, one which could not exist in the world today?" or "What did I get out of it? What did I contribute?" I have also answered some of the questions.

For one of the first times in my life I feel as though I have a good (although not complete in the theological sense) understanding of who God is. He is no longer someone who just exists somewhere or everywhere in creation. His Son is no longer someone who healed the sick, taught the people, and died on the cross. The Spirit is no longer someone who came on Pentecost Sunday and now lives on in the Church. God has become a real Person (or three real Persons). I feel as though He is really acting in the world. Fundamental in this realization of who God is was the liturgy of the Mass and the scripture services. But even further than that, I see Him in creation. I always considered myself an important person; I always thought of how God was in me. Now, I see God in other people. I look upon them as I look upon myself. I remember that they are part of the same Mystical Body of which I am a part. I remember that they, too, have the same emotions which I have. I love them more now that I have had this experience at G.P. A Christ-centered community opened my eyes to that part of everyone which, because of what it is, has to be loved. If civilization could be organized in the same way, I think the results would be the same. This is where the dream comes in. I was disappointed when I returned to "civilization." Where was the community spirit (outside of the family or maybe the school)? I remembered my wonderful experience and wondered if trying to keep it up would end in frustration. But I thought that this experience was something that all should be given a chance to participate in. So I am going to keep on living the life of the community although not everyone will respond. I feel that the best way to do this is to follow Christ's words, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

V

I didn't really notice how much my eyes had been opened until I once again faced the pressures of school. I was able to cope with everyday deadlines and reports, politics, and practices with a keen sense of what life was really all about.

VI

I will not try to put my reflections down in an orderly fashion because that is not the way they come to my mind. I learned not to judge an institute by

its name, nor people by their eccentricities. I saw priests as human beings; I saw sodalists, very good sodalists, as human beings; I saw people who made Catholicism a "working religion," a term I had heard sarcastically applied to our classroom instructions.

We were a community because we loved one another. Now I know why so few understand that term today. We realized where our basic dignity lies, being creatures of this world united to God. There was no one to impress, no one to better, no one to dominate. There were only friends to make. A sodality must be such a community united in the world against worldliness. But that is only half the story; a sodality must also be a community within a community. If members of the sodality are active in worship and apostolates, they increase in grace and at the same time influence the needy they help. For some it is hard enough to be a true sodalist and to bring themselves to God. For others the real challenge extends beyond personal sanctification and demands that they bring others to God. The larger community is the school, the parish, or the neighborhood. The sodality must have an influence in this larger community. We discussed the poverty problem, the race problem, and the identity problem. People say there is a Black Problem in America today but to me it is a White Problem because they caused it some time ago and don't care enough to change it now. If we could find our identities in the community we experienced, why can't we give them this experience, why can't we help them in helping ourselves, and why can't we teach our schoolmates—and at the same time ourselves—to care?

There is a question of value and true happiness. The world presents things of value and opportunities for all kinds of happiness. The question becomes —"What lasts?" The world is to be enjoyed. Some reach the point where they cannot do without this enjoyment and at the same time they know they can do nothing with it. The happiness we experienced probably was not new to us and certainly did not stop when we left that Friday afternoon in August. We cannot, however, remain in the shelter of our sodality where other people admire rather than ridicule our attitudes and actions. How we make the whole school a sodality community is the big question. And yet I know no answers—and if I did my reflections would not ramble and would have an order. But we can always try.

Some reflections

The experience at Georgetown Prep was, of course, unique, and no high school could hope to reproduce it with its whole student body. But Georgetown Prep showed that a Christian community does fulfill a need for today's high school student; such a community is relevant and meaningful. And since last summer I have often reflected on our communal experience and wondered if this experience was not in some way applicable to our high schools. My thoughts are still tentative, but some paths and some directions

seem clear. In this section of the paper[3] I will attempt to define (or give meaning to) the phrase "Christian community" as applied to our high schools; I hope also to suggest at the end some ways of developing these communities. The comments will be groping rather than incisive, but will hopefully stimulate some further reflection and discussion of our high schools from this somewhat unusual point of view.

Towards a definition

The first necessity here is clarity: What *is* the high school when considered as a Christian community? And this question hides three other questions for clarification: What is a community? What does it mean to call a community "Christian"? What is the Jesuit high school as community? Let us treat each of these three questions.

A community is a group of persons who have some common interests. They are joined together by these similar interests into an active group in which each person is concerned not just with the common purpose of the group, but also with each of the individual persons in the group. Each person is related to the others, seeks to promote the participation of the other persons, and is bound to the others by a feeling of solidarity. There is a mutual awareness, a strong cooperation; experiences, insights, and convictions are shared. In a true sense each member of the community can be said to love the other members and to work together with them towards the community's common purpose; a real satisfaction and joy is thus derived from being in a community such as a family, a small village, or a closely-knit club.

What does it mean, though, to call such a community "Christian"? The Acts of the Apostles gives us a working description of a Christian community: "They broke their bread together in their homes, and they ate their food with glad and simple hearts, praising God and respected by all the people. . . . There was but one heart and soul in the multitude . . . and not one of them claimed anything that belonged to him as his own, but they shared everything they had with one another" (2:46–47; 4:32).

[3] Much of the material in this section is adapted from the author's "The Catholic High School as a Christian Community," *Catholic School Journal* 66 (1966) 50–51.

In a Christian community, then, there is deep love, sharing, and union—especially in the Eucharist—and Christ in some real way can be said to be a member of the community; he is the community's life and meaning. The basis of this union among Christians and with Christ is, of course, baptism, yet baptismal union in Christ is not enough to make a vital Christian community; at least some of the members' actions must be more or less consciously motivated by the spirit of Christ. Christ and the Christian life must be a recognized value, and the members must to some extent know, love, and imitate Christ as found in the gospels, in other people, and in all reality. Such a community is *in Christ* in the Pauline sense; they are united with Christ, belong to Christ, and have Christ living in their actions.

Finally, to consider the third and final aspect of definition, what does it mean to refer to the high school as a community? The Jesuit high school, it seems, is a paradoxical community—or rather communities—for at times it works as a whole and at other times it is fragmented and divided into groups. Let me explain. At a sports rally, for instance, the school acts as a whole; all the students are present together and are caught up in a common action. The same union is sometimes shown at an assembly or at a Mass. But this is not the normal situation in a high school; usually the real communities in a school are the smaller groups, such as a homeroom or an extracurricular group. Here the individual students are in close and frequent contact and a strong spirit of unity can develop; in normal cases the true school communities are the dramatics club, the football team, the homeroom. These groups have the close relationships and common goals which are needed to make a community; generally we must look to these smaller groups for the development of Christian communities in our schools.[4]

Developing a Christian community

After this attempt at definition the next question is how to develop these communities in our high schools. Again I do not propose to supply answers, but perhaps this paper can raise some questions about developing these communities.

[4] The place and value of the Sodality in such a structure comes into question. On this see below, pp. 211-13.

Individual roles might first be examined. What is the role of the president or the principal? Should they try to develop the community or should they leave the task to the homeroom teacher and the moderator of each activity? Probably both levels should be concerned and there should be more consultation and cooperation between the administration and the teachers in the development of a Christian community. But the main opportunity, it seems to me, belongs to the homeroom teacher—lay or Jesuit—and to the extra-curricular moderator or coach. What is the function of each student, of the student leaders, and of the student council? Of the assistant moderators and the other teachers? Surely the students and the rest of the faculty should be consulted and given some decision-making power and responsibility in the formation of communities. Finally, perhaps some interested teachers and administrators in a province could meet together during the summer for three or four days to discuss the problem of community and, even more important, to experience the development of a community among themselves.

Besides these individual efforts, the groups in a school can help to make themselves into Christian communities. First, they can develop their own natural community; homerooms, clubs, and teams can take trips together or spend a holiday together at the school. This is common in many of our schools, and such social activities build up a group spirit on which the Christian dimension is based. Perhaps a group can get together for a corporate Mass or (if they find it appealing) for a Bible service; Mass, for example, could be concelebrated by their priest-teachers in the chapel or outside or even in their classrooms. The boys could perhaps surround the altar, use a guitar, and carry up the bread and wine at the offertory. When a class goes away for a retreat, too, the group is offered an excellent opportunity to deepen the communal spirit through living and praying together and through common discussions—an opportunity which is often thrown away by a stress on complete silence during the retreat.

The school as a whole, though, must not be forgotten, and here too worship can play an important part in forming the whole school (at least occasionally) into a united group. The priests of the administration and faculty can concelebrate Mass for the faculty and

students; the students and faculty, for their part, can provide servers, lectors, and leaders of the congregation. All can join in reciting the proper and in singing hymns (with folk melodies if these appeal to the students). Around the altar and at the time of Communion the school community is united in Christ; occasional homilies can stress this theme. Finally, should the students ever be *required* to attend the liturgy, or is this violating a spirit of willingness and interest that is essential to a community?

Social action, too, seems necessary in a Christian community. Relieving the poor, making interracial home visits, teaching the underprivileged, helping in the fight for equal rights—these would both develop the communal spirit and would teach the students (and faculty) to *act* as Christians. Students, faculty, and administration could well work together in this; mutual respect and communication would inevitably increase. Perhaps the student council could ask for a scholarship (or raise money for a scholarship) for a good but underprivileged student. Perhaps each homeroom and extracurricular group might have a social project to work on during the year. And precisely through this work it is possible that the faculty and students might develop or perfect a realistic, altruistic, Christian spirituality.

Such, then, are some thoughts, questions, suggestions concerning our high schools as Christian communities. The importance of the community-experience is clear; the problem is creating this experience within the school structure. Experimentation is required, and Jesuits must be willing to try techniques or to think in categories to which we may not be accustomed. Humility is necessary for the administration and the faculty, for here we contact the students not as subordinates but as fellow Christians. Mutual discussion is needed to develop a liturgy, a Christian action program, a community that is fitting to *this* particular school. This community cannot be imposed from above by administrators or religion teachers or anyone else; it must grow organically from the students, faculty, and administrators. But the opportunities are great for us as Christians and as educators. The students' lives—and our own lives and communities—cannot but profit from the development of Christian communities in our schools.

PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

WILLIAM J. KERR, S.J.

a pool of acquired know-how

THE GROWTH OF SERVICE INDUSTRIES in the United States since World War II is a striking phenomenon. Of special interest among these service associations is the consultative agency—a group whose special competence it is to assist industry and other segments of the economy in more efficient production and distribution. Some consultative organizations have begun to bring their talents to bear on this nation's educational endeavor. Thus *Time* (Nov. 12, 1965) can report on the rise of "the little known profession of school consulting," best exemplified by the work of Nicholas L. Englehardt. The pioneering work of the Educational Facilities Laboratory is now familiar to all educators. The *Saturday Review* commented recently (Dec. 18, 1965) on the foundation of the National Center for Citizens in Education. Curricula in the sciences and mathematics have been created by groups which are national in scope. The Advanced Placement Program stands ready to help inaugurate and maintain programs in any school that asks them. The National Study of High School English Programs should soon have a transforming effect on English departments across the country. Indeed, the Jesuit Educational Association, as it is now constituted, could be called a witness to the need for collective concern for the educational enterprise. Although these various organizations focus on different educational problems, they can all be described as a pool of acquired know-how that can be tapped to solve common problems.

Unlike the fragmented nature of national education, with its cherished legal independence from the federal government, the Jesuit secondary schools of the American Assistancy have the unique potential to establish a thorough consultative agency. In principle

the Jesuit educational apostolate, and the items of Article III of its nature. But the scope of that organization touches every aspect of the Jesuit educational apostolate, and the items of Article III of its revised constitution are not felt effectively enough on the practical level by our secondary schools.[1] It is becoming increasingly evident that our schools, acting individually or on a province basis alone, often enough encounter problems they cannot solve on their own. Difficult as it is to determine the future, certain patterns clearly emerge. And although it is going to be more difficult to achieve the excellence we traditionally aim at, the following are a few examples of the many issues that a consultative agency might solve.

Faculty

Superior faculty will be harder to come by and to keep, particularly in mathematics and the sciences, where national predictions indicate a shortage of qualified personnel for many years to come and industry provides such attractive offers. To compete, we must find ways to provide equivalent financial incentives and an atmosphere that promotes professional growth and responsibility. We have not, as a group, found a way to give our faculty adequate recompense for their service, or fringe benefits of a financial or academic nature to keep them on the top of their field. With the change of focus and methodology in so many subjects, how many schools have enabled their teachers to keep abreast of these developments?

An equally pressing problem stems from our attitude toward lay faculty. No one today will actually state that lay faculty are merely an adjunct to Jesuit education forced on us by our own manpower problems. But actual events force one to challenge the idea that we really believe what we *say*. A token betrayal of real attitudes is the listing in some school catalogues of all the Jesuits first and then the lay faculty as an afterthought. We continue to conduct institute after institute for Jesuits only, as if the lay faculty have nothing to tell us. More substantial problems come from the restricted role lay faculty are permitted to play in the whole spectrum of Jesuit secondary education. We have robbed them of the power to initiate

[1] "Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 27 (1964–65) 87–88.

and awarded them for their ability to follow orders. On this point it is encouraging to read in Fr. Arrupe's letter to the fathers of the French schools: "Let us encourage them [lay professors] to assume in our schools responsibilities of greater importance and, for this reason, let us not hesitate to surrender . . . certain offices which come within the competence of our lay colleagues."[2]

How do we produce, attract, and keep a dynamic and aggressive faculty? Good salaries and fringe benefits and an atmosphere of freedom that promotes and rewards initiative and professional leadership are two essential requisites. It is the rare Jesuit school that can hope to accumulate such a faculty by itself. Yet, collectively, Jesuit education has enormous advantages in a potential structure to provide for lay faculty such things as non-monetary compensatory privileges, sabbaticals, faculty exchange, free course work at our universities, education for dependents, and the know-how to obtain various grants. A re-examination of the ingredients for a productive lay faculty in active and full partnership with Jesuits is imperative.

Student recruitment

Using the almost haphazard methods we employ now, it will become increasingly difficult to recruit the student body with which we work best and which has the diversity that is educationally valuable for the students themselves. It is clear that we have priced ourselves out of the market for a type of Catholic youth whose enrollment in our schools could provide our student body with a broad-based socio-economic foundation. Some schools are saddling themselves with an undemocratic, uniform, indifferent school population. Talented? Yes. Varied? No. James B. Conant has already made clear just what the educational disadvantages of such a totally homogeneous student body are.[3] The recently announced plan of the New York Province to provide scholarships for Negroes is an encouraging sign. In this ecumenical era it might be well to ask if we should actively recruit students of other faiths. If, as James S. Coleman contends, teenagers are influenced most strongly by their

[2] "Reverend Father General to the Fathers of the French Schools," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 27 (1964–65) 73.

[3] *The American High School Today* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959) 26–27.

own "subculture,"[4] we should take a more active hand in shaping the composition of our student bodies. A certain amount of lived pluralism seems to have educational value and mirrors more adequately the society in which the student is to live.

An intelligent substitute for, or a program that augments, the usual diocesan entrance examination will have to be well thought out. Undoubtedly this will entail more scholarship aid than is currently available in most schools. Again it seems clear that this can be better advanced and financed by a collective effort.

Finance

Unless we can do something imaginative and profitable with the various monies at our collective disposal, individual schools will be forced to deny themselves educational necessities for financial reasons. It is not enough to say that what is educationally desirable is administratively feasible. I am not referring primarly to building and construction, but to things even more central to the educational process as Jesuits traditionally conceive it: superior faculty; a well qualified and varied student body; and up-to-date educational materials, methods, and structures.

It was interesting to see in the questionnaire answered by rectors for the institute at Santa Clara how many wanted to learn more about financing. It is not impertinent to wonder if our schools need help in cost-accounting and the know-how to enlist steady alumni support through annual giving. Perhaps if a trained group turned a stern eye on our financial operations, new economic procedures could be found to stretch current income, and ways could be devised to attract more support for our enterprises.

Beside problems of faculty, student recruitment, and finance, there are other problems of some weight which influence the quality of our educational work. The following are a few examples.

One school's math department has a poor reputation with local eighth-grade teachers. Although they once deserved the reputation, the department has since improved. The grammar schools, however, have not learned this and continue to discourage their good students from going to our school.

Another school cannot tap a developing area of the metropolitan

[4] *Adolescent Society* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961).

complex because of inadequate public transit. But no attempt has been made to contact the transit company nor has any alternative solution been sought to provide prospective students with direct and inexpensive transportation.

A third school is located in an area whose population has altered socio-economically downward to a radical degree. While enrollment shrinks, no effort has been made to relate creatively to the new environment, to promote quality in primary education, for example. The inauguration of the Higher Achievement Program in the New York area and the growing involvement of our students in tutoring the disadvantaged are hopeful signs. Most of our schools are located in urban centers and not a few will be plagued by these and related problems in the future. We cannot continue to prescind from them. Where is the synthetic mind that will guide our schools in their evolution?

The preceding are examples not only of our inability to cope successfully with the immediate and Catholic community but also with the community at large. They indicate muffed opportunities in public relations and a more insular concept of the school's task than we can afford to entertain. Will each administration be left to its own resources to solve its problems, with all the time and mental energy that that involves? Couldn't a group which has acquired special know-how be consulted, with great savings in time and energy and some guarantee of results? It would seem that a national consultative service could play an essential role in our secondary schools. Without losing any of the autonomy they now possess, our secondary schools could be greatly aided by such an organization in fulfilling their educational goals and realizing their academic promise. As Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J., has noted: "I am convinced that our American Jesuit high schools are better than they ever were, and yet they are not as good as they were formerly—by comparison with the competition. This much is sure: our schools are not good enough. . . ."[5]

Jesuit National Consultative Association for Secondary Schools

The main outlines of this association, its composition and function, will be indicated under the headings of staff and research center,

[5] "JEA Institute for Administrators," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 27 (1964–65) 108.

visitation, and publication. The outlines are merely that; the detailed plan would necessarily be the work of several hands.

The staff, not all of whom need be Jesuits, would be permanent and of sufficient size. They would have special competence in major areas related to Jesuit secondary education: educational theory and practice, finance, federal and local legislation and foundations, psychology, sociology, demography, and public relations. In a word, the staff would be a knowledgeable body prepared to provide all the services outlined in Article III of the JEA Constitution, in concert with an individual high school. Such a multidisciplinary, problem-oriented association should be connected with a large university where a wide variety of skills can best be mustered to solve complicated problems. The International Conference on the Apostolate of Secondary Schools showed interest in such an association: "in developing an Institute for Jesuit Education, preferably in conjunction with some Jesuit faculty, which might stimulate research into the great questions of Jesuit pedagogy, and serve as a training center for future Province Prefects of Studies."[6] Such an association would have a larger comprehension of the American educational scene, its trends and experiments and their outcome. It would bring a broader perspective to the practical problems of individual schools and would encourage the accumulation of data on the strength of which solid decisions could be reached. It would also have the machinery to evaluate programs thoroughly and comparatively. It is instructive that one of the committees at the Santa Clara Institute recommended "a central agency to serve as a clearing house for all reports on our successes *and* failures in the various methods of teaching Latin and to provide a national arena for open debate and discussion by theorists and teachers of the various philosophies of classical education."[7] What is necessary for Latin is undoubtedly necessary for other subjects as well.

The real strength of the association will come from its constant contact with the secondary school scene. For this reason, and to help

[6] "International Conference on the Apostolate of Secondary Schools," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 27 (1964–65) 75. For a description of an analogous institute, see Nevitt Sanford, "The Human Problems Institute and General Education," *Daedalus* 94 (1965) 642–661.

[7] *Proceedings: High School Administrators Institute* (New York: JEA, 1965) 136.

schools directly and concretely, the association should visit each school periodically.

Visitation

Some members of the staff together with some teachers from other Jesuit schools should visit each school every five years. This is important because neither the school nor the association will interact constructively by mail. The visit would be anticipated by a year-long self-study built around questionnaires for the administration, department chairmen, teachers, and some students. This feature would differ from the present approach of an accrediting agency like the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in its more intimate concern with the school's welfare and in its accent on the how as well as the what of implementing change. The association would aim to promote our traditional goal of excellence and work in terms of what *should be* and not merely what *is*. The primary function of the association would be didactic. It would have power to make recommendations and solve problems, but no power to enforce or publish its appraisal of any school for public consumption. Group dialogue and individual interview should be key features of the visit so that as much communication as possible occurs, and an official report should follow the visit in order to crystallize recommendations. As well as a report after each visit, the association should publish a journal each month of the school year.

The association should publish a journal with original material of both a theoretical and practical nature as well as précis from the vast amount of educational information of interest to our schools. It is a source of consternation that no journal exists which attracts contributions in any number from the administration and faculty of our secondary schools. A periodical especially tailored to our enterprise could do much to help bridge the educational information gap, not only between school and school, but between the principal's office and the faculty room and classroom as well. The journal would become, then, not only a vehicle for dissemination of information and ideas by the association, but by the people on the front line as well. Hopefully, successful programs, such as Advanced

Placement, would become familiar to all more rapidly.[8] And experimentation, like the shift to departmental structures, could be executed with fuller awareness of its implications and with less friction.

Financing the association

The question of finance is undoubtedly thorny. Surely, the secondary schools could not be expected to support financially the work of the association, although some charge could be levied for services sought and performed. It is difficult to ascertain just how far individual provinces could go to meet the expenses of the association. The university with which the association would be connected might be able to absorb some of the costs. Perhaps some foundation oriented toward education could underwrite much of the initial expense, and foundations of a specifically Catholic character are becoming more numerous. Perhaps a skillful wedding of all these monetary sources could launch and maintain the project.

It is becoming clear that Jesuit secondary schools cannot achieve with only their own resources the excellence they traditionally aim at. No one school can be expected to have access to the manifold know-how necessary to meet the challenges of modern education. Even if individual schools could grope their way toward satisfactory solutions to all their problems, the time-lag in finding them is generally costly in quality performance and reputation. As examples, this paper concentrated on problems central to the educational effort, faculty, and student body. The presumption was that individual schools are less likely to solve their own problems as effectively and as rapidly as a more comprehensive association of a national character with special competencies.

This national association, however, would in no way destroy or interfere with the autonomy of the individual school. The assumption is that the association and the schools will thrive only insofar as they work actively and harmoniously together. The recommendations of the association will be practical insofar as they are informed by the concrete circumstances of any given school. Further

[8] The number of Jesuit high schools which still have not inaugurated Advanced Placement programs, and related statistics, can be found in Robert R. Newton, S.J., "Self Renewal in Jesuit High Schools," WOODSTOCK LETTERS 94 (1965) 86–88.

communication between association and the schools, and between school and school, would be promoted by the publication of a journal to which both administration and faculty, lay and Jesuit, could contribute. Finally, the broad outlines of a way to finance the association have been suggested.

THEOLOGATE REPORTS

I: THE CONTEMPORARY ADOLESCENT

Today's adolescent was born and raised in a world of intensity, change, progress, turmoil, unrest. A generally prosperous, yet somewhat hollow, nervous age gives rise to short-lived fads, obvious openness, much freedom of expression, acceptance of mores previously frowned upon, a helter-skelter pace in all phases of human existence.

More specifically, we would underline the following causes or forces that affect the activity and ideals of modern youth:

a) availability of knowledge, due to a growing abundance of printed material, national and worldwide T.V. coverage, etc. Today's rapid dissemination of ideas results in a certain unity of awareness, and at the same time creates a demand for quick conformity or non-conformity.

b) speed—everything goes faster: cars, planes, music, people. The pace of the world has enveloped the whole of the teenager's life. The glib, fast-talking disc jockey is a fine symbol of this.

c) styles and sophistication—the assumed stance—have reached out from the vodka ads, the Marlboro man to touch the youth of our day.

d) a cynicism in our world has influenced the humor of today's teenager. Slapstick is out, subtlety is in. The wild exuberance that previously characterized youth has become a "cool" and unaffected desire for distance, aloofness, irony.

e) the breakdown of authority in the world and in the country. Rebellion has always characterized youth, but it is now much harder to dispel because of a similar rebellion among adults. The student who hears everyone criticized from president to pope, will hardly refrain from criticism of principal, teacher, and system. Nor is this an altogether bad thing.

f) the success syndrome of our country touches the ambitions or frustrations of our youth. The motivation for study, or even extracurricular activity, is often no longer knowledge or fun, but grades and recognition that will insure a better college, a better job, a nicer home, a bigger T.V., a warmer pool.

g) emphasis on the actual, the practical, the factual in our science-orientated age has done much to vitiate the imagination and the musing of youth. A pragmatic age makes its children pragmatists.

h) finally, the proliferation of ideas, the vast new fields of endeavor, of study, of thought have led the tyro student to frequent frustration, doubt, despair. The abundance is not synthesized for him and he feels confusion.

It is not strange that this latter seems a dominant, almost all-pervasive element in the teenager's experience. He is confused about his self-identity, confused in the face of felt isolation, confused about his exploding physical, intellectual, emotional reactions. Often this is the result of a double standard applied by parents, teachers, and society in general. Allowed and encouraged to act as an adult in so many ways, the youth is simultaneously forced to act as a child in many others. This problem, of course, is not a new one, but it is compounded today by increased independence (witness the car), coupled with increased dependence (e.g., the finances so necessary for modern living and recreation). In addition, the cold interpersonal relations of a complex and growing society have heightened this confusion, for the teenager is not yet able to anchor himself in a stable social group. Today, too, the perennial conflicts over values, religion, morality receive almost constant exposure in the public forum. At a time when the teenager himself is internally adrift, this can be an unsettling experience.

A few specific characteristics of modern youth, consequent on their environment, suggest themselves:

a) more intense intellectual curiosity, a "wanting to know why." No longer will students accept subjects that are assigned simply because they are assigned. Today's students want to know *why,* and if told why, will study much harder than their predecessors; if not, they will often not study at all.

b) deep seriousness; today's youth are not as carefree as their parents were, they do not have as much fun. The threat of failure, of war, even of annihilation have had their effect. Beneath the ill-disguised escape mechanism of constant activity lies an intense groping, searching, and questioning of problems beyond present reach.

c) sincerity; the youth of today are quick to respond to the human warmth of a teacher who is genuinely sympathetic and concerned about them. Perhaps this quality also helps to explain their intense and demanding idealism.

To our mind the most obvious need of modern youth, a need growing directly out of the myriad and confusing elements of his age is a need for synthesis. More than ever before, the aim of our schools must be to lead the student in classes, in extracurriculars, in everything he does to see how "it all" fits together. No science teacher can teach all science, no English teacher all English, but each can help the student to see the unity of his subject with the total human, and especially the total Christian, life. An education that is formative rather than specifically informative *must* give this type of synthesis or centrality to which the student can in college and in life add substance and facts.

Other practical points are perhaps less important and less conclusive, but noteworthy nonetheless:

a) The very numerous facets of knowledge demand that we heed each source. Some discussion and direction must be given to an intelligent and knowledgeable approach to current trends in T.V., movies, books, even hot-rod magazines, etc.

b) We must realize too that our students are continually experiencing the highly organized and imaginative ways of presentation employed by these media. Hence the greater need today for audio-visual techniques, variety, even entertainment in one's teaching. Also, the current desire for self-expression

among students should lead us away from the lecture platform to an admission that printing has indeed been invented. We must not simply "say" what could be read previously and now discussed for insight and synthesis.

c) The openness of modern youth should be capitalized on; not only the counselor but every teacher and coach must be truly interested in student problems, and not just in fulfilling obligations, or, worse, merely "giving time."

d) The tendency of today's teenager to rebel against authority must be taken seriously. We should justify our positions and beliefs to some extent and reflect to students the loving authority of God that we preach. Too often the we-said-it-so-you-do-it mentality of our schools is the image of religion that remains at graduation.

e) Similarly, we must share authority with our students. The student council must be more than a name. The individual student must have elbowroom to make his own decisions, and his own mistakes. This is essential for a developing sense of responsibility and leadership.

f) The modern world's emphasis on success demands that we embody the true meaning of education in our schools, indicate that we truly believe tests are not the sole criterion of achievement, and more importantly, that an individual's academic excellence is not simply a means to higher-salaried jobs.

g) Finally—since our students will demand it—we must justify first to ourselves, and then to them, the type of education we intend to give. We can no longer teach subjects simply because they have always been taught, or fail to teach other less traditional subjects, unless we can adjust such action to our total educational aims.

II: THE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE—IDEAL AND REAL

[It seems a significant comment in itself that neither of these headings (topics 2 and 3 of the workshop) attracted much reply from the theologians. Perhaps, as in the following statement, it points to a growing dissatisfaction with such generalized profiles. At any

rate, one hopes that Fr. Joseph Fichter's recent survey of our high school students will receive wide and rapid circulation.]

A good many are suspicious about formulating an ideal picture of the Jesuit high school graduate, suspicious that such formulations will encourage us to mold each student according to *our* ideas rather than allowing him to develop according to his own talents and capabilities. This would be a great mistake.

[Other observations seem almost as much a commentary on ourselves as on our students.]

Today's Jesuit high school graduate embraces many paradoxes. First of all, the paradox of having a high-powered academic curriculum (modern mathematics, science, literature) which makes him academically fit for college work, but spiritually non-integrated; he lacks power of transferring the conceptual to the operational or behavioral order of his life. Secondly, he lives the paradox of being very aware of today's social and communal problems, due to his acquaintance with communications media, but lacks the initiative to participate actively in working out solutions to some of these problems, due to the ivory-tower atmosphere of his studies. Thirdly, he is aware of the Church's role in society but fails to see himself as the Christian apostle working actively within the context of the Christian community. Finally, the veneer of his maturity is not recognized by his teachers as concealing the absence of real freedom and responsibility, and the presence of real emotional problems with faith and purposeful living. In a word, *there is a vacuum in his life between the intellectual and operational orders* which cultivates the lack of self-knowledge, personal initiative, and commitment—all essential elements of the whole Christian man so needed in today's society, and so needed to be "educed" in today's Jesuit high school.

III: TEACHING

The Christian formation of our students is accomplished by developing in them *attitudes which are Christian.* Since the prevailing attitudes of both faculty and administration have a definite effect on the formation of student attitudes, this report will focus on several properly Christian attitudes which we thought essential for today's teachers and administrators.

The first of these is a sense of *relevance*. Evidence for this comes primarily from theologians' suggestions in the sphere of curriculum—namely, a desire for less Latin, greater emphasis on social sciences, modern languages, and natural science, practical electives, and honors programs, as well as more relevant material in the existing curriculum. It is difficult to see how a sense of relevance can be developed—both in the faculty and in the students—without using relevant materials.

A second attitude might be termed *adaptability* or *flexibility*. Evidence here is drawn from such items as flexible scheduling and grouping, choice of curriculum, the professional use of audio-visual aids, as well as educational television.

The ability to *initiate* captures the third attitude. The use of discovery-logic and intuition, stress on creativity and curiosity, and student seminars point to the new direction in intellectual motivation and develop an independence in the students; on the part of teachers, advanced degrees, in-service and summer programs, and faculty meetings are required to implement these suggestions.

Sensitivity is a fourth attitude which the student picks up from his educational environment. Fine arts and mass-media analysis in the curriculum, listening to others in a group discussion, as well as the student's relationships with his teachers, provide that environment. Especially important is the need for each teacher's continuing acquaintance with the field of adolescent psychology.

The final attitude to be fostered can be considered from two points of view. From that of the administration, it can be called *trust*. Items which develop this attitude are greater autonomy for the individual school, curriculum committees, increasing self-determination on the part of the lay faculty, use of the brothers in our schools, independent study for our students, and, in particular, a reorientation from our "non-trusting" discipline structure toward one based on the concept of student personnel, i.e., one providing service for many varied student problems and thus no longer merely focusing on (and often creating) problems of discipline. From the viewpoint of student and teacher, this attitude is called *responsibility*. For students it can be fostered by electives and inter-school seminars; for teachers, sabbaticals, departments with specified duties and a certain autonomy, as well as a genuine investigation of the learning and teaching process, can manifest such responsibility.

It is evident that these five attitudes and the changes which can foster them are clearly interrelated. The aim here has been to isolate the attitudes and to indicate directions for their development. Hopefully, by the very fact that Jesuits and Catholic laymen are communicating such attitudes, their teaching will result in *Christian* formation. For it is precisely such attitudes, incarnated in the Christian lives of the faculty, that develop a meaningful Christianity in today's educational context.

[The following observation from another report seems all the more pertinent today when so many Jesuits are questioning the Society's heavy involvement in education.]

A unique contribution of the Jesuit educator should be an evident inner peace and joy in his life in Christ, the Jesuit community, and in the school. Nothing is so compelling as true happiness, and nothing is so quickly detected by our students as its absence. Such an absence is a great scandal, for its represents a lie. It suggests that the true following of Christ is not a joyous experience.

IV: RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Religion program

Since the fourth year course may well be the last formal exposure to Catholic values in our students' lives, the high school must encourage the student body to a vital experience of religion which will promote future growth and action. The goal of the religion program is to affect the behavioral patterns (Christian witness) of intelligent men of faith. The usefulness of the traditional academic approach of marks, classroom, primacy of content, and administrative requirements in intellectual religious education is questioned. If religion is to be an enjoyable experience, a worthwhile experience, a humanizing experience, an integrating experience, students will better pursue religion in smaller groups, on community projects, in environment-centered investigations, and ultimately by independent reading and research. The lay and religious teachers through whom the students see the possibility and value of Christian living must be professionally trained in the content and methodology of religious education and alive to the social and cultural possibilities of their environments.

Some suggestions would be:

a) Greater breadth of programs offered and wide experimentation in method and content should be encouraged. Although structure and core programs are necessary, the individual teacher should be free to innovate, to use the resources of his city, to engage his students with faculty and students of other beliefs. Courses in atheism, cross-cultural values, and non-Catholic religions would provide students with unique but essential insights into the Christian experience.

b) The students should have a wide introduction to source books (Bible, encyclicals, etc.) and periodicals that they will subscribe to and keep reading for many years—perhaps the best way to stay alive intellectually.

c) While there is need for faculty cooperation to prevent duplication, there is no need for a detailed and rigid curriculum in high school religion. As far as possible the individual teacher should control the intellectual content and experiences he or she provides the students in order to promote mature reflection on real problems, faith, values, and basic views.

d) In a student-centered program the individual teacher, equipped with proper training and provided with intellectual tools, in cooperation with his department but freed from the requirements of a standardized exam or required syllabus, is best able to encounter his students and to present the Christian response to God and to the world in an interpersonal way.

e) No teacher should "just happen" to teach religion. Men should be well prepared, enthusiastic, and influential with their students. Basic training in group dynamics and research project coordination is also needed, especially since the goal of the religion program looks to behavior as well as to content. Scholastics who are interested should be trained early in the course of studies for catechetics, and at reputable universities.

Spiritual exercises

The following are reflections on the objectives and structure of the three-day closed retreat for juniors and seniors. The approach taken with these two classes can subsequently determine that taken with freshmen and sophomores.

Through every retreat we seek to go beyond the instructional and moral to a profound religious experience of God encountered in and through *scripture, liturgy, doctrine,* and *other persons.* These four "signs" or modes of encounter are integral to any retreat program. Thus:

a) the role of the student in contemporary salvation-history, in the Church and the world, should be explored; his familiarity with biblical salvation-history can, hopefully, be presumed and built upon.

b) the personally transforming and socially unifying values of the liturgy should be both experienced and discussed, and in such a way that the values of private prayer, meditation are encouraged.

c) doctrine, religious instruction should be minimal during such a retreat. If the annual retreat is to be justified, it must offer the students an intense human and religious experience which they do not habitually find in the classroom situation.

d) this experience, this sense of community in Christ in the world can best be realized and strengthened in an atmosphere of personal involvement and group dynamics (including use of films, student panels in discussion). The positive value of involvement, no less than that of silence, should be emphasized —and in such a way that there is no heavy-handed pressure to "participate." Let there be freedom.

Towards a concrete program, we suggest:

a) that retreats be made in homogeneous groupings, such as homeroom units.

b) that a constantly growing homeroom (or group) identity is crucial, if the retreat is to be effectively prepared for and is to have lasting effects.

c) that each group be given the option of choosing its priest director (rather than his being assigned): one whom they not only respect but want to worship and discuss with (or, if this be now impossible, that the director assigned be aware of and sympathetic to current developments in the Christian formation of our students). We also recommend experimenting with a team of directors, one of them a layman.

d) that the director plan his retreat program so that it be closely integrated into the broader Christian formation program of *this particular group* (taking into account their doctrinal and liturgical background and their social action experience). It would be hard to overemphasize the director's responsibility to understand as fully as possible the group whom he is addressing.

e) that lay faculty, and scholastics (from the high school and our houses of study) be given a greater part in retreat counseling and in liturgical and discussion programs. College and professional sodalities might also provide men suitable for these purposes.

f) that the need for further experimentation be recognized by both high school authorities and retreat house personnel. Especially regrettable are the formalized structures, schedules, and readings of some retreat houses.

g) that each school administration be given the freedom to decide whether retreat participation is to be optional or required. This question of voluntary/mandatory participation is an important one and deserves serious consideration.

h) that there should be some type of follow-up; the homogeneous grouping should be assisted in consciously extending the implications of the retreat into their lives.

[From another report come further concrete suggestions.]

i) As far as possible both juniors and seniors should have the opportunity of making a closed retreat. Open retreats are most undesirable and should be avoided; the school building itself, the large numbers, the lack of facilities for realistic prayer experience, and other such factors create obstacles to a fruitful retreat which can, under some circumstances, even do more harm than good. If necessity dictates either an open retreat or nothing, the latter alternative has much to recommend it. Occasional days of recollection, perhaps two or three a year, should be held for the sophomores—in groups no larger than thirty-five or forty and preferably in a location other than the school grounds and on days other than school days. Our novitiates, other houses of study, or retreat houses might serve

the purpose. Something similar could be done for freshmen.

j) Preparation for the retreat should be started some weeks in advance to dispose each boy to profit fully from the experience. This might be accomplished in small groups, with one counselor working with several boys.

k) In the spirit of the Exercises, provision should be made for sufficient individual attention and close personal spiritual direction during the retreat. Ideally, no more than five retreatants should be under the direction of each competent director helping on the retreat. The emphasis of this direction should be on aiding each boy to discover and respond to his vocation in life and on teaching and directing the practice of the various methods of prayer.

l) Although the retreat should basically follow the Exercises, it is important that the proved techniques of modern group psychology, of cursillo, and other similar movements be incorporated into the three-day experience. Small group discussion, hootenanies, scripture services, night vigils before the Blessed Sacrament can well serve the purposes of the Exercises. Full, lively, and meaningful participation in the liturgy is an absolute necessity. Silence should have a significant place in the retreat, but the social aspect of Christian spirituality must also be taught and experienced.

m) A sincere effort should be made on the part of school administrators to get top-notch retreat masters. This is vital for a successful high school retreat. Similarly, the training of our men, particularly in theology and tertianship, should include much more study and preparation in understanding the Exercises and in giving them. This training should incorporate actual experience, a sort of apprenticeship, under the direction of men competent and experienced in giving the Exercises.

Liturgy

The basic problem is: what is happening in the liturgy and at Mass is *foreign to the lives of the students.* There is an absence of the clarity and flexibility of word, music, and action that young people identify as relevant vehicles of self-expression.

Since the liturgy is "the summit and font of all the Church's activity" (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, 10), there is an ob-

vious need to bring our students to a realization of the vital role that it can play in their lives.

Some suggestions:

a) The liturgy in the high school should be directed at the teenager. The students should have a truly active role in its planning and execution (students should be the lectors, servers, make up their own intentions and songs, etc.).

b) The liturgy should be as little an imposition on the student as possible. Regular Mass certainly should not be imposed as a matter of obligation. On the other hand, the types of Masses, the times they are scheduled, the attitudes toward the liturgy and the participation in it by faculty and administration, as well as the way it is offered, should all help convince our students of the liturgy's central importance to their lives as maturing Christians.

c) Similarly, Mass should be celebrated in as wide a variety of ways as possible so that the personal needs and wants of the students are at once recognized and respected. Moreover, at least two or three times a year our students should experience Mass in one or more of the Oriental rites so that they can more deeply appreciate the Church's universality, even in her liturgical worship. And to emphasize the continuity between school and parish in their Christian formation, parish priests known to some of the boys in the class might be invited to preside on occasion either at Mass or at a scripture service.

d) Liturgy flourishes in a live and cohesive Christian community. Our students will participate more readily in the liturgy if they come to it from a Christian atmosphere that pervades the whole school. The community in a sense must be there to start with. Hence it is important that students see the faculty (Jesuit and lay) as a community at worship. Community Mass for the scholastics, for example, might be celebrated at a time and place so that students could attend.

e) Small groups, too, are important. There are many communities within a school which can be of great advantage in the promotion of meaningful worship. There could be Mass for homeroom groups as well as for the newspaper, basketball team, debate team, or any other activity. This type of community

worship would not only help realize the student's desire for group identity but would also be an educative experience in the true communal nature of liturgy.

f) The relation between liturgy and religion course is a crucial one. First of all, the religion program should educate students in the language of the liturgy and in the forms of liturgical worship. The religion period could be well used in this way to provide explanations (historical, theological, pastoral) whenever liturgical changes are introduced either throughout a diocese (e.g., the restoration of the prayer of the faithful) or within the school (e.g., concelebration at Masses where the entire student body is gathered together, as at the Mass of the Holy Spirit; the use of a scripture service at a student assembly during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity; the practice of reading scripture passages in the school chapel as a penance after confession). The time could also be used for simplified exegetical explanations of scripture readings that will occur at the next Sunday's Mass, for practice in singing and in the reading of scripture texts by lector and congregation, and for the composition of relevant petitions for the prayer of the faithful.

g) The religion course should also act as an integrating force, showing the connection between doctrine, worship, and social activity. At present our class schedules are tailored to the teaching of doctrine and are less ideally suited to class worship while severely restricting the possibility of meaningful apostolic activity for the group. As educators, we must be willing to experiment with new forms of religious education—programs, for example, that clearly connect the students' liturgical life with their apostolic orientation as Christians.

Perhaps each class could adopt some worthwhile cause outside the school and support it for an entire semester: food brought to a class Mass and included in an offertory procession could be distributed to a poor family outside class time by the instructor and one or two of the students; money similarly collected and offered at Mass could later be presented to a pastor or non-Catholic minister for the poor of his parish or congregation. Aside from food and money, the personal

services of a group representing the entire class could be similarly offered at Mass and the group then do its work after school hours under the guidance of the teacher. The brotherhood of all Christians could also be experienced through the liturgy by inviting a non-Catholic minister to preside over a service of scripture readings and common prayer.

Also worth studying for possible adaptation in our schools are the high school CCD programs now used by parishes for the religious education of public high school students, and whose value and success lie precisely in their integration of liturgical action, doctrine, and apostolic commitment. One such program is described by Father George Seeber, S.J., in an article entitled "Catechetical Crisis: an Answer and a Hope" that appeared in *Ave Maria* magazine for March 6, 1965. (Fr. Seeber's article has received both international and ecumenical recognition. It has been published in *Katechetische Blatter,* a leading German catechetical journal, and the Minister of Education of the Metropolitan Methodist Church of Detroit has asked permission to use the article in training teachers of high school youth.) A slight adaptation of Father's program could provide the structure for a six to ten hour workshop of Christian formation during which students hear lectures, discuss, read scripture, engage in apostolic work, eat, worship and recreate together. The following day's religion class would consist in a report on the apostolic work and an evaluation by the class of the previous day's activities.

There are strong reasons for thinking that only this or some similar type of integrated religious education program can implement the liturgy to best advantage in our high schools.

h) Finally, it is important that the student chapel(s) be liturgically inspiring and genuinely conducive to worship. Similarly, classrooms and corridors should display a tasteful awareness of relevant liturgical art and sculpture.

Sodality

We recognize that the meaning of the term *sodality* has evolved during recent years and that it cannot be used on all levels (high school, college, professional) without careful distinction. As far as

the traditional Sodality is concerned, the *Guiding Principles* (presented by the Council of Directors and Moderators to the general assembly of the National Federation of Sodalities in New York on October 9, 1965) apply to much of what we say. In this report, however, we will for the most part prescind from these *Guiding Principles*, for we wish to adopt a different starting point and a new view of the Sodality.

Our basic concern is the students' personal spiritual development and apostolic awareness. Such Christian development is fundamentally the function of the whole Jesuit school and not just of one segment (the traditional Sodality). Consequently the school's Christian life must be centered in the classrooms and in the extracurricular activities, the basic structural units of the school and its fundamental Christian communities. Sometimes these basic units will be successful in the Christian development of the students, and sometimes not; success seems to depend on the faculty member involved and on each particular class.

Some students, however, will desire and need a further deepening of their relationship with God: private and communal prayer, mutual encouragement, and experimentation with new types of individual and group action. Such students may well form a new group —a small Christian community with perhaps eight students and a lay or Jesuit faculty member—though frequently they will already form natural communities based on friendships. In any case, the recognition of these deeper Christian needs on the part of the boy and the formation of such Christian communities will normally depend on the insight and the initiative of the faculty.

At this level the name, if any, given to these groupings is not important, nor is it absolutely necessary that they be incorporated into some larger federation. What is of importance is that their concern for Christ be deepened by their experience together and that as a group or as individuals they show concern for the Christian life of others. The internal structure of each group can be organized by the members themselves with the help of the faculty member with whom they work. The goals which such groups establish for themselves should be flexible enough to fit into new opportunities which may emerge within or outside of the school.

Such groups will, of course, build on the liturgical life of the school; furthermore, these groups will serve the school and the com-

munity. One group, for example, may help fellow students with studies or with extracurricular projects, another may engage in a home-visit program or in a series of living-room ecumenical dialogues. The frequency with which all the groups meet together at one time must be left up to themselves and to the faculty members involved. Occasional days of recollection, dinners, or general meetings may prove to be helpful to students and faculty alike. Perhaps one faculty member could be appointed as coordinator of activities.

In the small group framework the idea of an elite group does not exist in the same sense as in the older Sodality manuals. The notion of a relatively few living the "Sodality Way of Life" has yielded to the possibility of a relatively large number of students, whether in the classrooms, or in the extracurriculars, or in other groups, trying to concern themselves intensely with the Christian life.

Much of this group activity, we believe, will represent a valid incarnation of the traditional Sodality values as set forth in the *Guiding Principles* and as they should exist in the era of Vatican II.

Apostleship of Prayer

[The following statement is representative of the general consensus of opinion.]

In a spirit of honest re-evaluation, it seems necessary to express serious doubt about the formative value of the Apostleship of Prayer in our high schools. Since it is no longer a relevant way of Christian formation for students today, it simply has no effectiveness. Rather than desperately holding on to the Apostleship, it would be far better to search out practices that grow out of the students' needs. Artificial and outmoded structures can serve little value.

V: COUNSELING

[Unfortunately, there was little response from the theologians on this topic. The following statement, however, offers an interesting suggestion.]

We accept at least a two-fold division into counseling (a Jesuit or a layman) and guidance (preferably a layman). There is no need to divorce the two completely as long as the individual involved makes clear his shift of roles in a given situation.

Other Jesuits should assist the counselor. This implies some adequate *formal* training for them, perhaps during the summer months. They could refer more difficult cases to the fully trained counselor. Whenever possible, counselors and guidance men should have adequate secretarial help, lest they become mere clerks, as it seems many Jesuits have actually become. The guidance man/men —who should handle vocational or career guidance as well as college placements—should travel to make and maintain personal contacts at as many colleges as he can. This job could be handled very well by a layman.

VI: ADMINISTRATION

The adequate formation of our students should be the primary determinant of educational policy and personnel structure within the Jesuit high school.

Inherent in any valid use of the term *formation* is the provision of an educational context that will assure the development of the following values: realistic preparation for future life, self-identification, ability to choose, personal initiative, personal conviction, maturity consonant with the student's age. Such values must be specifically acknowledged and fostered by the school faculty as a whole and must be part of the very atmosphere in which the students live.

A school faculty can hardly promote such an atmosphere unless they experience it in their own regard. Where each department and each department member feels immediately responsible for the excellence of its programs and techniques, there can flower a certain creativity, self-sustaining criticism, and professional spirit that will energize the student body by its very vitality.

It is right that one man—the principal—bear the overall responsibility for simultaneously fostering and guiding this creativity and initiative. The principal's job demands a fine balance of functions; he should be the policy maker in all educational matters that transcend departmental lines and avoid the extreme form of laissez-faire leadership that can be equally as dispiriting as monolithic rule. At the same time, if the school is to be alive, he must invite originality and initiative in departments and individuals, respecting ideas even when they differ from his own. It should be one of his goals to

stimulate the growth of ideas from below in preference to imposing them from above. He must, therefore, while exercising care for excellence and order, avoid confusing his role with that of others, such as the disciplinarian, student counselor, department head, or moderator.

The attainment of such a balanced perspective in a principal would seem to call for a man of broad educational training and experience. To assure this, the Jesuit principal should normally have obtained the doctoral degree in education or its equivalent. It is likewise highly recommended that he be acquainted with educational systems other than our own and thus be able to re-evaluate constantly the procedures of his school. The achievement of the Ph.D., it is believed, will help provide him with an essential background of mutual relations, both general and specialized, with other educators, institutions, or agencies that can vitalize his thinking and contribute to the effectiveness of the Jesuit school.

Under these conditions, the Jesuit principal would have to be assured a rather free hand in the running of the high school. He alone presumably would have the specialized training required for the complex operation that the present-day high school has become, and he too could not convincingly stimulate the desired values of initiative and creativity in others unless he experienced a relative autonomy in his own functioning.

For this reason we recommend a serious consideration of the *principle of subsidiarity* as it applies to our high schools. It should be noted that subsidiarity represents a somewhat different nuance than does the concept of delegation, focusing not so much on the descending authority structure as on preserving and stimulating the full competence of the lower body. In the light of approaches sanctioned by the General Congregation, we feel that the American Jesuits might well re-evaluate governmental structures in view of their educational goals. The structure itself may inhibit development.

VII: EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

The main purpose of extracurriculars is to encourage each student, both as an individual and as a part of a group, to develop his initiative, creativity, social awareness and responsibility in the school and in the community. Our goal then is to have each student actively

engaged in some activity requiring time and commitment on his part. This would include non-school activities such as parish and civic organizations.

We might conceive of our extracurricular program as a broad-based pyramid with the student body as a whole engaged in intra-school activities and competition and those few who excel engaged in inter-scholastic activities and competition. Thus, the norm of success for our extracurriculars should be measured not only by the number of games or trophies won—though these are important too—but also by the number of students involved in activities which are helping to develop their talents by providing opportunities for the exercise of imagination, initiative, responsibility, and for experiencing the social problems of our day.

The extracurricular activities are a vital part of our educational system and, where feasible, should be closely related to our regular curriculum. It is important that a faculty-student committee clearly spell out how a particular activity can be of service to the student. In addition, every two or three years there should be an unbiased evaluation by a similar committee of the relevance and success of the school's activities in relation to overall goals.

The school administration and the faculty should consider these activities as the responsibility of the entire school. Thus, all teachers, lay and religious, should be encouraged not only to involve themselves in extracurriculars, but also to initiate new types of activities when student interest or need dictates. Steps should be taken to insure the transfer of technical know-how, etc., when a moderator is changed.

There is need for coordination in the use of facilities. After school intramural sports are encouraged. A number of schools delay varsity practice for an hour so the larger group of students can use the school's limited facilities first. These facilities should be readily available to students (and the neighborhood) on weekends and during vacation periods.

Our schools should present a greater variety of activities to the students (e.g., fine arts, cinema clubs, wrestling). We should not hesitate to hire a moderator jointly with other schools and to utilize all the assistance offered by museums and other civic groups. Where feasible (e.g., dramatics, glee club), we should cooperate with girls' schools; it is good for boys to work with girls in a context other than

the purely social. More academic competition, festivals, awards for special projects, etc., are encouraged.

It is desirable that the student council have a true voice in the running of extracurriculars, in the financing of them, in publicizing them. The students, too, should exercise an active responsibility in decisions concerning their activity—including the handling of finances. Student initiative to form new activities corresponding to changing interests should be especially encouraged. Finally, if the activities are to be truly student-oriented, students, and even moderators, must be allowed to make real mistakes.

Since poor marks are usually unrelated to extracurricular involvement, policies which curtail a student's activities because of poor marks should be discarded. It would be more beneficial to find out the true cause of mark deficiency and then determine an appropriate solution to the problem.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

THREE PRIOR QUESTIONS

As Jesuits committed to the high school apostolate, we should look forward to this summer's Workshop on the Christian Formation of High School Students with high hopes for its positive influence on Jesuit schools. Yet in looking over the topics for discussion, we cannot help noticing a certain timeless quality about the headings suggested. The same headings could have been used for a workshop held in 1866. It is possible that these *are* the perennially important questions for which contemporary answers must be found; it is also possible that we are not asking the right questions. If this latter is the case, there is little hope for answers that are more than a rehash of so many other past declarations.

It is characteristic of the man turned toward the future—the man of vision—that he asks searching, even embarrassing, questions. Fortunately, it is this type of question that is being asked more and more by Jesuits today. Instead of "why have a Sodality in our high schools?" the question has become "why have high schools at all?" If our only response to these Jesuits is that this is what they have signed up for, we may produce docile, resigned men, but certainly

not creative, imaginative educators convinced that the high school is a viable apostolate.

The problem is one of structures. If men are to be drawn to the work of a permanent structure, they must be able to see a real continuing need for its existence. When they begin to suspect that a structure exists merely for its own sake, they rapidly lose interest in its welfare. Such is the suspicion of many today regarding our high schools.

Years ago we committed ourselves to a college preparatory program for high-quality students with the aim of producing Christian leaders. As college pressures became progressively more demanding, we were forced to expend much effort in reinforcing our curriculum with enrichment programs, Advanced Placement, more and better language courses, and the like. Our efforts have been praiseworthy, but have they left us with the time, men, money, and energy to face up to existing evils within the American social structure? The great emphasis on social involvement today, both inside and outside the Church, is causing many Jesuits to question whether our high schools are contributing anything to this social revolution, either by forming socially conscious Christian students or by involving the institution itself in social activity.

We must face this question honestly. Perhaps the Jesuit high school has its hands full already. Perhaps the institution is going full speed with its own version of apostolic work. This is one answer; clearly we do not condemn a busy Catholic hospital for not starting a tutoring program. But the problem of social revolution, and more specifically the problem of the inner city, bumps up against our schools whether we have time for it or not. Our schools, feeling the reverberations, have reacted, do react, or will react in any number of ways: raze the old place and move to a suburb; stay in the inner city but form a tiny academic ghetto; stay wherever you are and involve yourself with the social revolution; move into the inner city to encourage involvement. In any event, the social revolution is not a phenomenon we can simply ignore.

With these general thoughts as a background, we would like to suggest a few headings that seem pertinent for discussion this summer. First, what is the relation of our high schools to the inner city? A workshop designed to seek ways and means to effect Christian formation in our students cannot fail to take this into

account. Are we to assume that the question is to be raised and answered only at the local level? Why try to arrive at general norms on "the ideal graduate" or "the liturgy" and not attempt any norms on this very relevant question? The absence of such a topic, or any like it, from the workshop agenda suggests that it was simply not thought of. This, we feel, is unfortunate.

Let us consider a second question—that of minority groups. The conflicting feelings of some Jesuits, those now teaching, those in theology, and those about to teach, point to a diversity of thinking in this area about the relation between our social and high school apostolates. Everyone knows that "you do what you can" on an individual basis, but there is growing demand for more definite policy than this. An older generation pointed with pride to St. Peter Claver who "did what he could" for the Negro; the newer generation acknowledges his individual heroism but wonders why an institution cannot also be heroic. For a considerable number of Jesuits this would mean changing the character of our student body to include many students of college potential from minority groups who normally could not afford our schools. Some even suggest that we conduct a college preparatory school for minority groups only. These ideas, if carried into practice, would be risky, costly, and fraught with problems we have seldom faced. But the Society by tradition has not been afraid of risky and challenging work.

The problem of economics is a real one. What originally was meant to be intellectual selectivity has perforce become social selectivity. It is no secret that the majority of boys who enter our schools are the ones with money enough to pay the tuition, and this means that minority groups in any numbers are excluded. Thus we have token integration. Is this all we want or can handle? The workshop might profitably concern itself with this question of the Jesuit High School and the Integration of Minority Groups.

Since the problem of finances has been lurking in the background, let us bring it into the open. Let's ask whether the economics of a situation determines the kind of school we run. Is there any truth in the unpleasant possibility that we need our students more than they need us? Would it be economically possible for us to integrate a school to a ratio of 60% white and 40% Negro if we believed this desirable? Or do we resemble the man running a lunch counter who would like to serve a Negro but can't, because if he does he'll

lose his livelihood—that is, his white customers? Are we obliged to follow just a few paces behind secular society so that we do not offend the middle class that supports us? Can we afford to be pace-setters? If the institution has us trapped within its four walls, desperately trying to make ends meet, then the apostolate has become subservient to the budget rather than vice versa. It would not be the first time in Church history that this has happened.

This then is our final question, the Jesuit High School and Financial Solvency. Some may feel that one should first discuss ideals and then hope that somehow these can be inculcated bit by bit into the school. We would think that a workshop ought to attempt some solution to the first great snag that any idealistic plans are going to meet. As a Society we ought to be front-runners in the Church and in the world. If we find that economics becomes the main determining factor of the type of high school we run, then something must be radically wrong.

These three questions we have raised might not be treated in this workshop. They are not on the agenda. The immense problems they suggest may continue to be solved on an *ad hoc* basis. But as we continue to solve them, either heroically, poorly, or not at all, we ought to reflect carefully on the often-heard statement: Our students come to us with certain values and prejudices as freshmen and leave with the same values and prejudices as seniors. We may have given them a good academic education that will get them into college, but have we formed them as Christians to take their place in the modern Church and in modern society—a society that is vividly aware of the social problems of the twentieth century and trying hard to do something about them? Before we can begin to discuss the twelve topics listed for the Workshop, we must seek answers to these prior questions if we are to enlist wholehearted support among many loyal but questioning Jesuits.

Leo B. Lackamp, S.J.
Edward J. Mattimoe, S.J.

EVASIVE EDUCATION

WHAT ARE THE REAL QUESTIONS that our students are interested in? What are their fears, their hopes for the future, their frustrations, their disillusionments? Too often we presume that we know the answers to these questions. This is regrettable, for if we and our curriculum are not in tune with the minds of our students, if we are not meeting their real needs and interests, if we are not answering their most nagging questions, then we are failing them badly. And such, I fear, is the case.

What are we teaching them for example, that will help them to understand the issues at stake in the war in Vietnam? This is a disturbing question for today's youth, and one whose aftermath they will inherit and be responsible for handling successfully. What are we teaching our students that will help them form mature judgments about draft card and even human burnings, about pacifist rallies and criticism of our government's foreign policy?

What are we doing to help our students understand civil rights, segregation, the Southern and Northern mentality nourishing it, and the atrocities perpetrated in its name? And what about our poverty problems, our slums, the immorality and violence that these ghettos breed, the injustice that surrounds them? What are we teaching them about these issues?

Did we not undertake the education of the sons of upper middle class families so that these young men would become leaders in exercising Christian influence on society? Are they doing so at present? Have they done so in the past? Or have they merely helped to perpetuate a prejudice power structure that compassionate men despise? Should we continue to give them the exclusive benefit of our training if they have merely used their skills to spin cocoons of security? Perhaps we should attack the problem directly, and train those who will really profit from our knowledge and efforts, and who will subsequently revolutionize society out of honesty and gratitude.

A further question is America's changing standard of morals. How are we helping our students to understand this phenomenon and its influence on movies, television, plays, literature, and college life? How have we been preparing them to face the atmosphere of student freedom, rebelliousness, dissatisfaction, atheism, and the like that they will soon encounter on college campuses? There is

clearly something wrong with the curricula and personnel-mentality that college students are rebelling against, and it is the same curricula pattern and mentality that informs our high school course structures. Is our control over a vastly more informed high school student body too overbearing and rigid? Even if "control" offers no practical problem, what about the effects of repression and frustration? We do not want robots in our schools whose expressions mimic and conform to our ideas, but whose hearts are many miles away.

I have often heard the question asked: Why do we lose contact with nearly a third (the percentage increases) of our senior class? Why have students who entered our high schools on equal footing—all of superior caliber—drifted into two or more bottom classes (the so-called bums or dregs)? Are they simply "bad" boys, the incorrigibles? Is this just the law of averages—the survival of the fittest? Or do the answers to these questions lie in our own blindness and neglect?

Have we been sealing off ourselves and our curricula from the real issues of our fast-changing culture? Have we been consuming time on outdated matter that pushes aside truly meaningful subjects? Are we hiding behind irrelevant grammar, literature, and extracurricular activities? Should we not jettison what is passé? When St. Ignatius advised scholastics to study well even those subjects that offered no practical value or future applicability, was he recommending that the Society make impracticality a cardinal rule of its educational process and philosophy? Was he asking us to be dishonest and irrelevant?

PATRICK HUSSEY, S.J.

RELIGION PROGRAM

ALTHOUGH CATECHESIS (or, as it is usually called, the teaching of religion) is not a panacea for all the problems that beset Jesuit educators in their efforts to train genuine Christian young men, we of the religion department are trying to use the resources of the catechetical renewal to make a significant contribution.

Many of the teachers are trying to impart a personalist catechesis, with emphasis on free response in faith. The old rationalistic brainwashing techniques, with their authoritarian slant, are gradually

being phased out. The Novaks-Nelson series of texts have helped a great deal toward this end, though we still have a long way to go.

Our teachers, by and large, are strong in their grasp of scriptural data, and a good deal of solid theology is being offered. This challenges the boys, and many of them respond. Many of the teachers are still weak in religious psychology, and sometimes are fuzzy in the area of personalist approach. Hence the student rarely gets four teachers, over the four years, who can give a certain continuity of attitude. For those teachers who do not have a firm grasp on the principles of good catechetical procedure, the limitations of the textbooks present a great obstacle. The big problem we have is that of finding and training teachers with a solid background in catechetics. We have no lack of men learned in seminary theology and even in current theological developments; but these assets do not insure a good catechist of teenagers.

Although there are still many discouraging aspects of the whole picture, the encouraging fact remains that each year a few more boys begin to get involved and to get an inkling of what Christian commitment is. Some teachers and some classes are making breakthroughs, and when they do, the ferment is impressive. They begin to relate religion to life, and to become existentially concerned. They often lack those good old time-honored hallmarks of "good" Catholic boys—docility, piety, unquestioning allegiance. They are skeptical, demanding, hard to convince, wary of clichés and simplistic piety. They are often passing through genuine crises. But something profound is happening here—something more than the preservation of religiosity. A "faithful remnant" of the committed and the concerned is beginning to appear, and they are the hope of the future.

The large number of the apathetic and unresponsive is discouraging, but perhaps Kierkegaard would remind us that people who are capable of genuine Christian commitment will always be in the minority.

The religion course now concentrates on biblical study, liturgical initiation, and group discussion. The aim is to help the boys interiorize values for themselves, once they have become grounded in the basic elements of the Christian message. We try also to make them *informed*, as well as loyal Christians.

For the few who become most involved, the school provides an outlet for active witness. The Christian Action Core, formerly known as the Sodality, gives them an opportunity to translate their beliefs into action.

James DiGiacomo, S.J.

The following remarks represent the tenor of thinking among members of our faculty teaching religion courses.

In discussing formation of our students, it is most important to appreciate the total background in which our students have lived and continue to live their lives as Catholics. This is not a constant factor by any means; in fact, it will vary greatly from one section of the country to another and even from one locality to another within a section. What we have in mind in particular is the cultural milieu of the locality and especially the religious ethos by which it has been and continues to be conditioned. It is this milieu in which our students grow up and live their whole lives. How does it condition their thinking and value judgments? What pressures does it exert on them in the conduct of their lives?

It might be assumed that Christian formation is a set of indispensable qualities which we as educators must foster in our students. And yet, if a crop is to flourish, account must be taken of the soil and weather to which *this* crop is exposed. So must our efforts to develop Christian principles and attitudes take account of the local "ground" of principles and the local "climate" of attitudes which shaped and continue to shape the personalities of our young men. Any effort to foster the Christian character must come to grips with the needs of the particular situation in which we are involved. The Jesuits of each place must know the cultural influences which are at the roots of the mental attitudes of students in *that* area and must know how best to adapt the formation they impart to meet the requirements of *that* area.

An example may be in order. Consider the situation of a Jesuit school in the "Bible Belt" of the South, in a community so predominately Protestant that Catholics make up only 7 or 8 percent of the population. Add that the only institution of higher learning in the community is a church-related (Protestant) college and that

the various Protestant parishes are numerous, well-attended, and have profound influence upon the lives of their adherents. In such a situation, any program of Christian formation conceived on a national scale will have to be adapted to a cultural climate quite different from that in most other communities in which Jesuit schools are located. The situation described is one which differs completely from that in Boston or Chicago and which does not even approximate the situation of a large Southern city like New Orleans. One could imagine that differences of this kind—very wide differences—doubtless exist between communities like Milwaukee and Baltimore or between St. Louis and Los Angeles. The point is that the example of a Jesuit school in the "Bible Belt," though at the extreme, is not an isolated instance of wide differences in cultural climates from one section to another.

What practical consequences might such a factor have on a program of Christian formation? First a look at the practical consequences of this factor upon a Jesuit school in just such surroundings as were described above. One conditioning factor that can emerge from a community dominated by Protestant Christianity (as in the case cited) is this: Christ is the founder of a *natural* religion. In the collective mind of such a community Christ is acknowledged, revered as divine, accepted as part of history. His teachings are admired and held as the norm of proper conduct. But on every level, this structure rests upon, is defended, and fostered by one basic criterion: its appeal to a man's reason. Christ's commands are accepted because they are reasonable; we accept what we do about him also because it is reasonable; even faith is reduced to an exercise of the natural faculties of man. In such a climate there is no room for the supernatural, neither supernatural revelation, supernatural end of man, supernatural abilities for which we are totally dependent upon God, nor a supernatural union with the Creator through a liturgy.

Out of such a conditioning of their lives come students whose grasp of the most fundamental fact of Christianity is debilitated by this prevailing cultural view of Christianity. They have accepted all the criteria for judging their relations with God and with Christ which the prevailing "collective mind" of the community has imposed upon them. This may have profound consequences upon the

view such students take toward ecumenism. They may view ecumenism as an attempt of various denominations to find unity in merely external aspects of Christianity. Unless they understand that there are differences between us at the very marrow of Christianity and that we have a profound contribution to make in the area of the truth of Christianity, there will be no hope for a genuine ecumenism.

To sum up our contribution, we are fearful lest a study of the formation of the Christian character issue in a set of recommendations conceived purely on a priori grounds. We urge that following the lead of modern theological trends and indeed the lead of Vatican II itself, we give serious thought to the existential dimension in the formation of the Christian character.

John R. Welsh, S.J.

APOSTOLIC AIMS

The basic purpose of our high school apostolate is to make Christianity an integral part of the lives of our students. Christianity ought to be a compelling and relevant force in their lives at the present time and in any consideration they may make of their future.

I am convinced that one of the essential means of effecting this attitude is the example of the teachers and staff. Each teacher, Jesuit and lay, must mirror his commitment to the Christian ideal. He must show by his words and actions the relevance of Christianity in his own life.

The school years should not be regarded as a period of time apart from real life. School years *are* real life. Therefore, the idea that the Jesuit school is merely preparing for life should be discarded. Our students must commit themselves to the Christian ideal now. They are not merely practicing now to manifest the Christian ideals in later life. They must want to be total Christians here and now.

These ideals must become part of our teachers' habitual way of life. This is the first step towards making our schools vitally Christian.

John W. Kelly, S.J.

I QUESTION WHETHER, in today's rapidly changing and complex world, the Society should be so heavily committed to secondary education.

Would it not be more profitable for the Society to expend its talents and energies in fields that make a greater impact on the world? I find it difficult to see where the Society is making a profound contribution to the formation of outstanding Christian men through its work in secondary education. The results appear to me to be no more than ordinary.

A Guidance counselor

THE GENERAL STATE and direction of our high school apostolate is certainly good, and productive of good, but I believe that our schools are still far from the ideal toward which we should be striving. It seems to me that we could approach this ideal more closely if the ideal were clearly defined and then *accepted* by every individual on the staff. When this complete unity and sense of dedication is a fact, and not just a hoped-for objective, only then will it affect the student body.

We are still too concerned with hide-bound tradition and the possibility of failure. If the traditions we have been following are all that they are supposed to be, where are the concrete results? It is high time that we stand back and take an *honest* look at the needs of the day, regardless of tradition. It is wise to follow it when the results prove its wisdom, but we should never be slaves to it.

Discussions and meetings have a very definite value in bringing to light various problems and practical solutions, but unless those in authority accept these findings and apply the solutions offered, we will move nowhere fast. Unfortunately, those in authority are not present in sufficient numbers at these meetings, so they cannot really absorb the whole truth. Those not present may read the résumé, but this they do in the light of their own concepts—often mixed and unalterable. And so Nero fiddles while Rome burns.

A Religion teacher

IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1965

Edited by Robert C. Collins, S.J.

FRENCH JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

"Social Crisis and Spiritual Reform at the Beginning of the 17th Century: 'A New Spirituality' Among the French Jesuits" ("Crise sociale et réformisme spirituel au début du XVIIe siècle: 'Une nouvelle spiritualité, chez les Jésuites français"), *by Michel de Certeau, S.J.*, **Revue d'ascétique et de mystique** 41 (1965) 339–86.

In the early seventeenth century a group of French Jesuits raised a very controversial question. In a society dedicated to apostolic work, they asked whether some works were incompatible with their Jesuit vocation. Their basic point was that certain works were spiritual and others were not; only the former were proper to the spirit of the Society. Because of this they were called "spirituals, innovators and mystics" (in the pejorative sense of these terms), since they seemed to be denying the basic axiom of Ignatius, "Find God in all things."

The "reformers" would only allow such activities as preaching, giving the Exercises, spiritual help and direction. They opposed these to more mundane activities, just as they contrasted supernatural graces (the promptings of the Holy Spirit) with mere natural or ordinary callings.

What had happened? First of all, the conception of the Society was changing among Jesuits, even as the Jesuits and their activities and the world in which they worked were changing. Secondly, their problem involved itself in an attempt to be loyal to the spirit defined by the founders and also defined by the historical development of the order.

This crisis was not only in France; it characterized the entire generation. This article studies France in particular because of the prominence of the French school of this era and its great men and works: Lallemant, Surin, Rigoleuc, Huby, and last, but most important, the North American Martyrs.

What were some of the problems? First, the mushroom growth of the Society; in fifty years it had grown ten times, to more than thirteen thousand members. Size was therefore a difficulty. In addition, the

question of how the Society was to remain united in an age of growing nationalism bothered many. Further, men of the Society had entered specialties which were not progressing and developing independently of religion and even of the spirit that had led the Jesuits to take up these studies and fields. The two chief problems, then, touched the internal organization of the Society and its external activity as it worked in an increasingly secularized Europe.

The question of nationalism naturally had been most acute in regard to Spain, which was now in decline. The Society had long been dominated by its Spanish membership and this was now changing, but not without difficulties. In the transition period many attempts were made to limit the power of the general, to ensure homogeneity in the Society, and to prevent nationalism from being a serious factor in the Society, while the Spanish requested special consideration for Spain, e.g., alternate Spanish and non-Spanish generals. (Attached to a request for such an alternation sent to Rome in 1608 was a request to reduce the time of formation on the grounds that it was taking up too much of a Jesuit's life and that many were leaving the Society because of this.)

Contemporaneous with these requests was a series of studies and evaluations of the Society which found their full flowering in an investigation, *De detrimentis Societatis,* which Fr. Aquaviva demanded of every provincial congregation in 1612 and on which he allowed every father to send in his own thoughts. The dossier still exists and reflects well the judgments made upon the Society by that generation of pioneers and apostles. It also reveals the different reactions to the new problems that had arisen.

In France the official responses were especially concerned with problems of spirituality and are both revealing and severe. The responses report two chief complaints of superiors: lack of interest in the spiritual formation of their subjects; and purely exterior, authoritarian rule. The failure of older fathers to give good example is noted. In general the complaint is that while all are eager to excel in the sciences, they are more diligent for their intellectual work than for the spiritual. In the classical phrase, there is too much *effusio ad exteriora*, which is the root of all the evil.

As the article notes well, the immense labors of the French Jesuits of this time, the shortage of manpower, their poverty, the disruptions caused by the Thirty Years War and other religious conflicts are sufficient to explain the lack of freedom and time to devote themselves to contemplation.

There were a number of individual responses which were equally revealing. To Fr. Coton the chief causes of difficulty were apostolic

activism and insufficiency of spiritual formation. He insisted on the importance of motions of the heart, on purity of intention, and interior preparation for the sacraments as remedies. His point is that God is not so much concerned with how effective a Jesuit is in his work but how affective in his prayer, intentions, etc. The emphasis here seems to be that the true religious will find God and then bring Him to the activities, the things he deals with, which is a reversal of the Ignatian formula for finding God in all things. The difference is significant and it is this spirit rather than that of Ignatius which will characterize certain members of the new spirituality.

Clean and untouched

The problem became intense when the remedy and methods were proposed. For the subject was supposed to find God by keeping himself clean and untouched by the world ("immaculatum se custodire a saeculo").

The reports reveal the two key problems clearly: the need for a developed spiritual doctrine for the Society, and the difficulties of reconciling almost unlimited apostolic work and what appears to be the spiritual weakening that seems to accompany this work. For the first problem the development of the full meaning of Ignatian spirituality brought a solution for some; others were drawn along by the wave of great mystical and theological writing that appeared at this time—by Catherine of Genoa, Catherine of Siena, Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, Theresa of Avila, John of the Cross, Luis de Granada, and others.

During the years of Fr. Vitelleschi's term as general (1615–45), the problems became more acute. In contrast to the more daring Aquaviva, Fr. Vitelleschi's distinguishing characteristic was excessive prudence and caution and his favorite adjective was *periculosus*. He reveals himself in his correspondence with the French Society as a spiritual man, a dedicated and conscientious religious, but also as almost obsessed with the "dangers" that "menaced" the Society and that were the result of the "novelties" being introduced.

The years 1625 to 1635 were the time of troubles in which the so-called extraordinary devotions became prominent and clearly identified with what might be called an anti-humanistic bias. Fr. Vitelleschi wrote frequently to the superiors and urged vigorous action against the movement as it appeared in Poitiers in 1626, Limoges in 1627, Lyons, Paris, Bordeaux, Dijon, Nancy, and other areas. Two elements in this controversy should be noted. The first is the growth of devotion to St. Joseph that was associated with the movement. According to one author it was characteristic of all the great souls of this century. The second point is the association (in the minds of many) of this development in spiritual-

ity with the contemporaneous movement called the *Alumbrados* in Spain, and the condemnations of the so-called *Illuminati* that were issued in the period of 1630–35. The association, of course, made the movement in France fall under suspicion immediately, regardless of whether or not the association was justified.

A further point is the fact that this movement was especially associated with the scholasticates and with a desire for reform. It was a movement largely composed of young Jesuits. They were greatly influenced by the *Life of St. Theresa* written by Ribera, only recently made available to them in the brilliant French translation of Jean de Bretigny. In one sense those who were caught up into the movement by this book formed a sect-like group, with partisans throughout the various houses in France.

For the members of this group, the conflict was often critical and painful as they tried to reconcile their interior life and orientation with the exterior organization and structure in which they lived. Needless to say, the movement was not restricted to young Jesuits, although this study concentrates on them since information on them is available more readily and in greater quantity. The new spirituality influenced many others besides the Jesuits.

The study raises a question before it goes into a detailed account of several of the more prominent members of the new spiritual movement. It asks why it was that after the survey conducted at the outset of the century on the problems of the Society, which revealed a need for renewal of the spirituality of the Society and rededication to the spiritual life, there was so strong a reaction against men who were doing precisely that in their emphasis on the spiritual life of the individual as holding the place of prime importance. This reaction was very strong in Rome, which was constantly sending out remonstrances and urging strict action, while the superiors in France seem to have been loathe to take action and felt that Rome did not understand the situation and overestimated the danger. Perhaps the authorities in Rome, particularly Fr. Vitelleschi, always saw the problem in the light of developments of a somewhat similar nature in Spain and in Italy, especially the Quietist movement.

The entire group in France would probably have passed away nameless and unknown but for the fact that a number of great men who came from this milieu wrote on spirituality. Jean-Joseph Surin and Jean Labadie are studied elsewhere. This study goes into detail on a few lesser known but perhaps more representative figures, Pierre Cluniac and Jacques du Tertre. The materials are contemporaneous with the period when the famous Louis Lallemant was tertian instructor (1628–1631), teaching what became his *Spiritual Doctrine*.

Pierre Cluniac sent a record to Rome at the end of 1627, when he was a philosopher and twenty-one years of age, and this spiritual diary was read by the Fathers Assistant as well as by Father General. The latter had felt earlier that this scholastic revealed a bad spirit and urged that his superior have him begin his novitiate over again. It was perhaps to reveal his spiritual life, at the urging of his rector, that Cluniac had sent his diary to Rome.

Devil and early death

The diary reveals a very imaginative and impressionable temperament; as a young boy he had always been terrified of the devil (a common characteristic in the spiritual writings of this era). The novitiate had been a period of aridity in prayer for the young man, perhaps because of the rigidity of institutions and formalized prayer when Cluniac was already inclined towards the prayer of simplicity. He says that he feels that he is called to a life of suffering and early death; but this is for him, as for others, an escape from the world. As the author of the study points out, his spirituality is that of rejection of the world; it does not seem to include the full significance of the Incarnation. Cluniac admits that he is too eager in dealing with some of his brother Jesuits, but not with all—and the difference is important. The certain chosen ones are more exactly called his disciples.

This reaction was perhaps normal in view of the situation, but it brought only more suspicion upon the group. The young man seems never to have settled down; and after many changes before and after ordination, he finally left the Society in 1642.

The second figure, Jacques du Tertre, was a priest, aged thirty-six and teaching at the college in Bordeaux when he sent his spiritual autobiography to Rome at the order of his provincial. The theme of this writing is "ardor of the soul," a phrase common to Theresa of Avila and Catherine of Siena. For the young priest this ardor led to apostolic zeal and, most importantly, to the desire to obey his superiors, to distrust human things, to live in perfect chastity, and to be faithful to God in all things. Juxtaposed with this spirit and in contrast to it is activity and rules, yet Father Vitelleschi saw the difference between the two men, Cluniac and Du Tertre. The distinguishing characteristic for him was the devotion to obedience found in the writing of Du Tertre, for in being obedient to the Church he was responding to the promptings of the Spirit; Cluniac does not seem to have revealed this attitude. In spite of this limited approval, Du Tertre was still under suspicion; he was sent to La Rochelle in 1629, where he fell ill and died in early 1630.

The spiritual crisis had developed other men though, and so it continued. Surin was in theology in 1627, but was sent suddenly from Paris

under suspicious circumstances. At Clermont he met a Fr. Claude Bernier who influenced Surin and François Rageneau. Fr. Bernier was soon under suspicion. It is difficult to establish exactly what he intended and actually taught, since his doctrine is filtered through the writings of François Chauveau, who was an intemperate disciple and may have gone beyond the intention or meaning of his master. At any rate, Fr. Bernier was eventually asked to write a life of Ignatius showing that the mystical life of Ignatius was as prominent as some of the mystics then in vogue.

Needless to say, the tertian instructor, Louis Lallemant, came under suspicion, and Father General wanted to know in 1629 whether or not he was "totus mysticus." Only sixty years later, in a calm and serene tone that does not at all reflect the stresses and strains of the time of its origin, did his *Spiritual Doctrine* appear (1694). It had lived through three generations and had left the crises behind. The essential elements are still present: the stress on guarding one's heart, following the spirit, union with God, and the reconciliation between action and contemplation.

The period of crisis was brief. It first came to attention in 1627, and by 1642 for the most part it was already in the past; the times had changed in that decade and a half. Now it was the age of Louis XIV, which would not stress flight from the world, but would criticize individualism and be immersed in social structure. The words *precious* and *devout* became objects of scorn; the world of classicism rose again. The spirituality of the young men of 1630 simply did not settle with the spirit of the new generation. Religion became more and more conventional, as could be expected in an age dominated by classicism.

Many intellectual developments were also making the "new spirituality" something passé. They are too subjective for that world which will be dominated by Cartesian principles, too unworldly and solitary. Their attitude towards the body and the world is too complex, too intense for the next generation. For these spiritual men the world was ambivalent, the place of trial. Yet it was these mystics who were the great evangelizers and missionaries.

In the end the problem can be found in a confusion existing in the mentality of this generation of spiritual writers. They tended to mix reform with the resistance to new structures which made reform necessary. Fortunately, the better element rooted itself both in the past and in the present, since for them the work of God was a creation which was at the principle of all activity. Their intention was always to ensure the spiritual basis of all such activity. The task of purifying one's intention was and is at the heart of all spirituality, of all reforms then and now.

Thomas E. Morrissey, S.J.

TEXT OF THE *EXERCISES*

"Father Calveras' Study of the Text of the *Exercises*" ("Los estudios del P. Calveras sobre el texto de los Ejercicios"), *by Cándido de Dalmases, S.J.*, Manresa 37 (1965) 385–406.

To FR. CALVERAS HAD BEEN ENTRUSTED the task of preparing a new edition of the *Exercises and Directory*. Fr. Dalmases in this article has a two-fold purpose: to indicate a summary of the actual amount of work done by Calveras and the state in which he left his projected critical edition at the time of his death, and of the present state of scholarly investigations on the *Exercises*.

The author uses the edition of the *Exercises and Directory* published (anonymously) in 1919 by Fr. Arturo Codina as a basis for his comparison regarding improvements in the text, and notes that there is no doubt that Calveras' principal merit is in his study of known texts, especially as regards their dating.

There is nothing really original gained here over Fr. Codina's work, except in the determination of dates, identification of copyists and correctors, and an estimation of the value and importance of each individual text. The author notes that Fr. Calveras treated many of the specific problems regarding the texts in various articles published elsewhere, and includes a brief bibliography of these articles, which are in Spanish.

Fr. Dalmases gives a brief history of the state of the texts, and shows that Fr. Calveras' principal accomplishment was in submitting the texts to an intensive study and fixing their dates and characteristics. Fr. Calveras calls attention to certain Italian fragments of the text whose copying seems to have been completed exactly one year (July 31, 1555) before the death of St. Ignatius, and notes that the edition contemplated by Fr. Calveras was to have omitted the Roothaan text, and devoted the space thus acquired to a clearer edition of primitive texts.

Vocabulary

Fr. Calveras contemplated also an appendix of all the Spanish words used in the text by Ignatius, together with their morphological functions and syntax. This work was greatly advanced at the time of his death.

Fr. Dalmases then lists Calveras' plan for his edition (an outline of the book) and gives the various sources which Calveras employed in his study. His plan differed from that followed by Fr. Codina in that he distinguishes between "inspirational" and "interpretative" sources. It is at this point that the bibliography of Calveras' work on both the Spanish and Latin texts (previously mentioned) is presented.

The conclusions which Fr. Calveras arrived at in his study of the handwritings which are found in the original copy or in corrections advance our knowledge but slightly. The identification of the writing in certain cases, i.e., St. Ignatius, Polanco, or Viola, is clear. It is less clear, however, in other cases, i.e., Bröet, Salmeron or Ferrão.

The principal result here of Calveras' work on the Spanish Autobiography was the fact that today we may definitively consider the copyist of text to have been the Portuguese Fr. Bartolomé Ferrão. In the last article published before his death, Fr. Calveras determined that the autobiography was copied in Spanish between the beginning of 1544 and May of the same year.

The author then discusses the various editions of the *Exercises*, together with their respective dates (which was the burden of Fr. Calveras' work). He concludes by wondering how useful the results obtained by Calveras will be, as it will be very difficult for someone else to continue Calveras' work in the same fashion. No two men can have the same notions of a critical edition.

Anthony S. Aracich, S.J.

NADAL ON THE INSTITUTE

"Jerónimo Nadal and his Commentaries on the Institute of the Society" ("Jerónimo Nadal y sus Comentarios al Instituto de la Compañía"), *by Miguel Nicolau,* Manresa 37 (1965) 173–76.

Miguel Nicolau, S.J., comments on his recent publication of *Orationis Observationes* (the spiritual diary of Fr. Jerome Nadal), which completes Volume 90 of *Monumenta Historica S.I.* and complements his previous volume *Commentaries of Father Nadal on the Institute.* Nicolau says that Nadal's *Commentaries* present his doctrine objectively, whereas his *Observations* are of a subjective character treating of concrete historical situations. The former contains: conferences given by Nadal in Spain in 1554, his Alcalá conferences, his "Dialogues" (Nadal's best work, according to Nicolau), and conferences held in Cologne. These are all published for the first time. Nicolau judges that in these works which he has edited Nadal has given us what religious institutes are looking for today, i.e., a theological and exegetical foundation for religious life, and a theological "thinking out" of the Institute of the Society of Jesus.

Gaspar LoBiondo, S.J.

IGNATIUS' DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

"Has Ignatius Only Now Arrived?" ("Ist Ignatius Erst Noch Am Kommen?"), *by Ludwig Kaufmann*, Orientierung 31 (1965) 164–71.

Has the significance of Ignatius, and the innovation in spirituality which he introduced, been accurately appraised up until this time? Was he a man far in advance of his time, obscured by the tradition-bound interpreters of his epoch, the first "Christian atheist"? Are we just now on the verge of comprehending the revolution which his *Spiritual Exercises* instituted? Such are the questions with which Ludwig Kaufmann deals. Kaufmann reviews some of the recent Ignatian literature, Ludwig Marcuse's *Ignatius Loyola* (1956), studies by Karl Rahner, Leo Bakker, Fridolin Marxer, and others, and comes to the conclusion that Ignatius' decision-making process as exposed in the *Exercises* (particularly in the discernment of spirits) holds peculiar relevance for the Church of today and the future, a relevance only dimly appreciated till now. Through Ignatius' ingenious conciliation of individual freedom and institutional commitment, his emphasis on concrete experience, the pluralism of graces, and the recognition that all men are called to salvation, his ascetical doctrine assumes great contemporary pertinence.

Kaufmann first treats the thesis of Marcuse that Ignatius was a dual personality, the founder of a "Christian atheism," and at the same time the defender of a secularized medieval Church, as this appeared in the Inquisition and Roman centralism (Ignatius' and the Pope's) in general. Marcuse's first assertion rests on his automatic dismissal of Ignatius' references to grace and the Holy Spirit as medieval superstition, incomprehensible to contemporary man. He avers that the real assumption behind Ignatius' decision-method lies in sheer self-reliant will power. It is this assumption, he believes, which enabled the saint to transform a "religion of consolation," in the spirit of Luther and Calvin, into a religion sponsoring world-dominating will power. What Marcuse misses entirely is that for Ignatius freedom was far more than mere will power, and that Ignatius had become the freest of men precisely through an existential experience of faith which revealed to him the incomparable possibilities of "freedom in the Church." Admitting that many of the classic commentators have obscured the method whereby Ignatius sought to kindle a "fire in the world," Kaufmann recurs to the recent studies of Rahner, Marxer and Bakker, all of whom agree with Marcuse on the issue of Ignatius' novelty, but differ radically in their interpretation of its significance.

The crucial material which releases the Gordian knot in this matter centers upon a re-examination of the Rules for the Discernment of Spirits (especially the Second Week's) and the Three Times for a Correct and Good Choice (#175), both of which are contextualized in certain of Ignatius' axial religious experiences in his quest for God's will for him. The Three Times are related especially to Rules 2 and 8 of the Second Week's discernments, centering on the notion of "consolation without a previous cause." For Marcuse, this latter phrase can mean little more than an extreme reliance on self. But in the broader context which these other studies bring to bear, the genuine object is that the exercitant find experientially, or perhaps better, "feel concretely," the will of God in all things. An experience in depth of God's direct presence to the soul is presupposed, and from this the exercitant's choice issues. The "causes" of the exercitant's feelings for the right decision are therefore not in his own self-will, but in God's will. Further, all dry rationalizing and intellectualism is eschewed; pre-note #2 is determinative: "Not much knowledge . . . but intimate understanding and relish. . . ."

Cardoner

Ignatius assumes that the well-disposed exercitant will to some degree have access to the same kind of experience he underwent on the banks of the Cardoner. According to Bakker, this extraordinary event is the essential *Sitz im Leben* for both the Rules for Discernment and the Rules for Thinking with the Church. The latter, a scandal to Marcuse, are reconcilable with the former insofar as "in Christ our Lord, the Bridegroom, and in his spouse the Church, only one Spirit holds sway, which governs and rules for the salvation of souls." (See Rules for Thinking with the Church, #13.) It is this one Spirit that guarantees that the uniquely personal experiences of the Exercises will not issue into conflicts with the mission of the hierarchical Church. As interpreted by Rahner, Bakker and Marxer, the remarkable experience at the Cardoner (where Ignatius, by his own testimony, gained knowledge which exceeded everything else in his sixty-two years) reconciled Ignatius' highly individual mission in life with the universal mission of the institutional Church, God's sign of salvation for all men. This interpretation receives reinforcement from Ignatius' letter of June 18, 1536, to the nun, Teresa Rejadella, in Barcelona: "It often happens that our Lord moves and impels our soul to one particular course or another by laying it open—that is, speaking within it without the sound of any voice, raising it all to his divine love, without our being able to resist what he suggests, even if we wanted to do so. In accepting such suggestions, we must of necessity be in conformity with the Commandments, the precepts of the Church, obedient

to our superiors and full of complete humility, for the same divine Spirit is in all."

It is equally clear that in the question of choice or decision, Ignatius precludes an option for evil. "It is necessary that in all things about which we wish to make a decision, they be either indifferent or good, and that they be accomplished within the sphere of holy mother, the hierarchical Church." Again, the experience at the Cardoner made all this clear to Ignatius and enabled him, with perfect equanimity, to subordinate his intense individual aspirations to the universal summons to salvation which the Church exists to declare to the world. The old woman at Manresa had asked that Jesus appear to Ignatius, and this request was fulfilled. The Rules for Discernment of the Second Week, coming when the retreatant has been disposed by the *via purgativa* of the First Week, suppose an analogous experience. To be sure, any decision arising therefrom must submit to the test of discretion (see Rule #8), but here we have a method which vigorously promotes the search for uniquely personal charism, which in no way conflicts with, but seeks to advance, the Church's mission to further God's plan of salvation for all men.

Of course, there will be tension between the personal pole and the collective, but it was Ignatius' conviction, arising out of profound experience, that we only remain within the "field of force" created by the Spirit in the acceptance of this dynamic tension. Only thus do the emotional consolations occurring in the Exercises escape idiosyncratic self-will, and assume direct significance for the general condition of mankind.

In view of Ignatius' extraordinary emphasis upon the individual's search for God's will, issuing in a unique sense of personal vocation, Rahner maintains that Ignatian doctrine carries weightly implications for modern theology. Ignatius underwent most of his momentous religious experiences and derived his basic insights without benefit of formal theological training. Only subsequently did he and his followers bring to bear traditional Scholastic terminology in order to interpret the insights previously attained. Rahner thinks the day is now imminent when we may reverse the process, renewing theological reflection by means of the faith-experience obtained through the Exercises. That is, we can use the Exercises to derive the doctrine of faith from the concrete experience of faith, and to disclose from this experience the relevant questions which determine the task and direction for theological reflection. All the more can the Exercises be employed to complement a moral theology of general principles with an "existential ethic" arising from the exercitant's effort to discern exactly what it is that God asks of *him*. As such, the Exercises appear excellently adapted to encourage that individual re-

sponse to the "signs of the times" in the light of God's salvific purpose. Marxer makes bold to assert that the Exercises, with special emphasis on their technique of spiritual discernment, promise to produce their real fruit only in our day—as a method designed to discover the individual's irreplaceable role in salvation history.

David S. Toolan, S.J.

THE PASCHAL MYSTERY

"The Paschal Mystery and the Exercises of St. Ignatius" ("El misterio pascual y los ejercicios de san Ignacio"), *by Ignacio Iparraguirre, S.J.*, Sal Terrae 53 (1965) 145–54.

It is evident that St. Ignatius does not speak of the paschal mystery in the same way that the Constitution on the Liturgy and contemporary authors describe it. If the paschal mystery consists in the descent of the Word into the world and the passage of the Redeemer to the Father through His life, death, resurrection and ascension, then the Spiritual Exercises can be used as a method of living this "passage" of the Lord by dying to everything which is not Christ in order to rise with Him to a new life.

Christ is represented as "Eternal King and Universal Lord" who in the fullness of time obeys the eternal decree of the Trinity and becomes incarnate to save mankind by undergoing many trials, including death on the cross. This same Lord rises, ascends to heaven, whence he calls every man personally; and as bridegroom of the Church He guides us for the salvation of our souls. This is the kernel of salvation history. Our response is to rejoice in the glory of our Lord by participating in His work, which continues to recreate the world. The paschal mystery is something objective which takes shape within each man as he contemplates the panorama of salvation history. This experience which thrusts each man into the paschal mystery is conditioned by man's intrinsic reality as a creature. As such he is destined freely by God to ascend to Him. But in order to achieve this destiny he must neutralize the tug of disordered affections and put aside everything which does not lead him to his final goal. By dying to everything which is not conformed to Christ he will rise with Him to glory. By suffering and dying Christ triumphed over death and gave us true freedom.

In union with Christ we discover His passage to the Father especially in the events of the passion and resurrection. In the passion we contemplate not only the material sufferings of Christ but also the function of the divinity and the humanity in the mystery. In the resurrection the

exercitant contemplates the joy of Christ triumphant. God has destroyed our death by the death of Christ our Lord, and thanks to this action of Christ we triumph through Him and with Him.

Although St. Ignatius does not explicitly treat the exodus of the people of Israel through the desert, he does nevertheless express two derivative notions of this event. The first is the spirituality of the desert. The function of solitude is not to provide an apt climate for personal prayer and penance, but rather it is a means of contact with God in order to establish an orientation for future activity under the divine guidance. The second derivative is the covenant alliance God makes with each man in his vocation. This individual pact is an integral element of the covenant between God and the elect. This covenant alliance is perpetuated in the Church. Obedience is the response to the new alliance; it is the oblation, the holocaust which ratifies it. Through obedience man allows himself to be guided by the mighty arm of the author of every good. Thus obedience is unintelligible apart from Christ's triumph over death, which was a passage to the Father. Our obedience becomes a participation in the power of His resurrection.

RAYMOND A. ADAMS, S.J.

IGNATIAN OBEDIENCE

"The Inner Sense of Ignatian Obedience" ("Sentido intimo de la obediencia ignaciana"), *by Luis Mendizábal, S.J.*, Manresa 37 (1965) 53–76.

THE INNER SENSE OF THE OBEDIENCE of a Jesuit will be found if we can answer adequately this question: Why are Jesuits "sons of obedience" (1 Pet. 1:14)? St. Ignatius established this structure of obedience guided by a supernatural prudence more than by a conclusion from explicit reasonings. In no published document did he ever give a straight answer to our question. In several documents he talked about the necessity of training subjects in obedience, but he used the common reasons offered by other religious orders. Nowhere did he state *why* this obedience is asked from the professed Jesuit, why he instituted this firm life of obedience which needs a special training. The answer to all these questions can only be found in St. Ignatius' *Autobiography*, enriched by the documents of the *Monumenta*. In this way we will be able to feel the ontogenesis of Ignatian obedience, since we know that obedience was not the first step in the Ignatian idea; it appeared at the end, after seventeen years of spiritual formation under God's guidance.

In his *Autobiography* Ignatius tells us that his spiritual life started with an oblation of his whole being to the Divine Majesty. He was

initiated in the discernment of spirits and concluded that one must follow exclusively the divine motions. He went to Manresa and after this experience he moved under the guidance of God, submitting himself to particular human interpreters of the divine will. Once he had enriched himself in solitude and had obtained interior unity, he saw men as likenesses of Christ. This same docility to Christ urged him to preach the Gospel. In this context of apostolic preaching would appear the idea of religious obedience. In his apostolate during this initial period he would observe the obedience of a layman to ecclesiastical authority, but for many years he would not even think of a religious regime.

In Paris he would gather his first companions, the main object of this gathering being not the efficiency of "teamwork," but mutual help so that the individuals of the group could better assist their neighbors. That is why the Bull of Paul III was directed to each one of the ten first companions by name. All of them took vows with the same formula, but each one in his own name and with responsibility before God alone. This community of life had some resemblance to a religious order, mostly during the period in Venice, where they were divided in groups of three with one acting as "superior" on a rotating basis for periods ranging from a week to a month.

We do not have the text of the vow formula of Montmartre. In substance (taken from a letter from Laynez) they intended to: "consecrate themselves to God in the public ministry in the Holy Land if God would accept it." If they could not go to Jerusalem, or could not stay there, then they would present themselves to the Pope. They would have recourse to the Pontiff only if Divine Providence did not direct them immediately. St. Ignatius calls this clause in the vow to going to Jerusalem "our origin and principal foundation." How can this be?

When, in 1537, the trip to Jerusalem seemed impossible, St. Ignatius underwent a period of darkness. It seemed to him that Christ did not accept his oblation to follow Him so closely as to live in the Holy Land. He had to find a new "way" of following Christ.

This is the context and meaning for the vision of La Storta. Ignatius was accepted "with" Christ carrying the cross. For Ignatius it was a clear sign that he was accepted under Christ's standard even if he would not be going to Jerusalem. For Ignatius Rome seemed to be a place where he would be "crucified," a new Jerusalem. He did not think that this cross was going to be a life of obedience. In this life he would later recognize all the humiliations and sufferings he longed for in Jerusalem.

Once the Inquisition did not find any error of doctrine in the group, they presented themselves to Paul III. The Pope could have simply accepted the offering of this group, but he accepted them in a way which

surpassed all expectations: Paul III accepted the group directly under his obedience. It could be said that the Society of Jesus exists because of the "obedience of understanding" with which Ignatius and the group accepted the Pope's plan. This was not yet the birth of a new religious order. Nevertheless this vow to the Pope would be the foundation of what was to come.

The vow formula of the professed Jesuit throws light on this special relationship to the Holy See. The vows of poverty, chastity and obedience come first; then is added: "insuper promitto oboedientiam Summo Pontifici." This is not something accessory. The person taking the vow does not join himself as an individual and in an absolute way to the Holy See, but *as a member of the Society*, which renews in each one taking the vows its obedience to the Pope.

That is why the Pope is not a special superior of the Society. The Jesuits, by virtue of their vocation, dedicate themselves to apostolic work in a universalistic framework, the determination of what kind of work should be undertaken in this wide spectrum belongs only to the Holy See "via auctoritatis." So, the authentic aim of the obedience to the Pope is not to be sent materially by the physical person of the Pope, but to have a certain authoritative determination of the greatest objective good in the universal horizon opened to the Jesuit in order to fulfill his own vocation. The Pope can delegate this power to determine specific undertakings. That is why when the general of the Society determines some specific work for a member of the Society he is acting "in persona Christi mittentis," which is a function primarily priestly and not simply administrative.

Up to now we have been dealing with the "mission" aspect of the vocation of a Jesuit. The special obedience to the Pope is limited to the pontifical "missions," according to our vocation. In everything else the first group was not then bound, not even after being accepted as a new religious order, by any "special obedience" to the Pope, no more than any other religious order.

The corporative aspect of the Ignatian obedience, which developed from the oblation to the Pope to the institution of a religious order under obedience, is clearly stated in the document *Deliberatio primorum Patrum*. This is, in summary, the development of the ideas exposed in the document.

Ignatius thought that the Pope would send the group as a unit to a special mission. This was not the Pope's idea; he scattered them in small groups throughout Italy. Obedience to the Pope seemed to destroy the group. After careful deliberations they decided to find unity in obedience to one of the group. During these deliberations they proposed some

objections to the new type of life. Would the obedience to one of them be the means intended by God so that they would put in practice with greater merit the first desires which united them? Those "prima desideria" were not exactly to obey the Pope, but to fulfil in everything God's will. The problem was not the creation of the Society of Jesus, which somehow already existed, but the organic growth of this Society. It is interesting that the main objections to a life of obedience at that time were those being presented nowadays: difficulty in submitting their own will and understanding to a superior in a way which they feared would be harmful to their apostolate and to an increase in the number of members.

The deliberations ended with a unanimous acceptance of a life of obedience under one superior. Their aims were: to fulfil better the "prima desideria" of their vocation; to preserve the Society; to take care of any problem that might come up in the spiritual or temporal orders.

As the group grew in number and endeavors, it was logical that the general would delegate his authority to local superiors.

This was the obedience of the professed Jesuit. The formation of houses of studies to prepare future Jesuit priests gave a new and final touch to obedience in the Society. The letter to the students at Gandía summarizes Ignatius' view on this. The young men in training should live under obedience, since their future life as Jesuits will demand complete obedience. The period of training is a perfect opportunity to exercise it and gather strength for future work. Moreover, the Society needs men who can guide others in the ways of our Lord. Obedience is the perfect training for aiming all our potentialities "ad maiorem Dei gloriam," and overcome natural disorder. Obedience is at the same time the crowning of a Jesuit's life and the best training for finding our Lord in all things.

For Ignatius and the first group obedience was not an end in itself, but a creature. They accepted it when they realized that it was *the* way to fulfil their vocation. Once they had accepted it, they selected the obedience which would better serve their aims. For the Jesuit theologians at Trent, obedience was not a pious formula, but the crucifixion with Christ which Ignatius had accepted in the vision of La Storta.

MARIO RODRIGUEZ, S.J.

PROGRAM TO PROMOTE THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

IN OCTOBER 1963, Rev. John J. McGinty, S.J., Provincial of the New York Province, set up this program and appointed Fr. Thomas A. Burke, S.J., as director. The program has an office at St. Peter's Prep, 144 Grand Street, Jersey City, New Jersey. Later in 1963, the Fathers Provincial of the American Assistancy, at their annual meeting, approved of this venture

and appointed one Jesuit in each province to be the province representative in this matter, with Fr. Burke as coordinator of all the activities dealing with the Exercises. In October 1964, the Fathers Provincial set up the program as an assistancy project to assist all American Jesuits.

The purpose of the program is to interest, prepare, and assist as many Jesuits as possible in the giving of the Exercises.

To accomplish this, the director has been able in two years to print over sixty articles done by experts that will help Ours. So far, nine bulletins have been sent out to over 2000 Jesuits, listing various books and articles available at the office. Also, the director has visited tertianships, theologates, philosophates, and novitiates helping to encourage Ours in this apostolic endeavor. Finally, this program has been well received by many of Ours living in other countries. The response in the two years of its functioning has been gratifying. The following are a few of the articles most recently made available:

"The Meditation on the Two Standards and its Scriptural Foundation," by Stanislas Lyonnet, S.J. (trans. by Philip J. Donnelly, S.J.). $.75. This is the first complete translation of Fr. Lyonnet's article in *Christus*.

"Pope John XXIII and the Exercises," by H. Roper, S.J. $.50. A brief study taken from *Journal of a Soul* dealing with John's knowledge and love of the Exercises; his stress on the need of adaptation.

"The Preached Retreat," "The Directed Retreat," by John Coventry, S.J. $.75. The first article deals with the content of the retreat interviews and time order. The second article treats of the retreat—more common in Europe—where public speaking is at a minimum, the retreatants being directed individually.

"A Biblical Presentation of the Exercises," by J. Volckaert, S.J. $.50. These twelve pages will be a help in drawing up a scriptural retreat.

"The Ignatian Experience as Reflected in the Spiritual Theology of Karl Rahner," by Avery Dulles, S.J. $.75. "Rahner makes the idea of Ignatius so completely his own and interprets Ignatius so much according to his personal theology, that the two almost merge. He consciously makes use of the *Spiritual Exercises* as a theological source."

REPORT: INSTITUTE ON JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS ST. MARY'S, KANSAS

The Kaw valley in Kansas must seem the most unlikely of places for a meeting of Jesuit and Jew. However, an institute on Judaism at St. Mary's College was the occasion for such an encounter. The two-day meeting on February 21–22, 1965, was sponsored by the College and the Jewish Community Relations Bureau of Kansas City in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish Chautauqua Society. The results of what was possibly the first of such institutes held in a Catholic seminary were rich beyond all expectations. From the opening address by Rabbi Jakob Petuchowski of Hebrew Union College to the eloquent after-dinner summation from Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee interest and involvement grew.

The Institute was designed to introduce Jesuit seminarians to contemporary Judaism. It is implicitly an acknowledgment of the sad history of Church and Synagogue that such an introduction is required; but it is. We were most fortunate in having men of learning and unmistakable sincerity to do the introduction for us. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, who has worked closely with Cardinal Bea's Secretariat, discussed the history of Jewish-Christian relations, including current developments and new programs to increase mutual knowledge. This critical topic with its potential for defensiveness and recriminations can easily constitute a barrier rather than a source of communication.

The following words of St. John Chrysostom are, to put it mildly, ecumenically embarrassing:

> I know that a great number of the faithful have for the Jews a certain respect and hold their ceremonies in reverence. This provokes me to eradicate completely such a disastrous opinion. I have already brought forward that the synagogue is worth no more than the theater . . . it is a place of prostitution, it is a den of thieves and a hiding place of wild animals . . . not simply of

animals, but of impure beasts. . . . God has abandoned them, what hope of salvation have they left? They say that they too worship God; but this is not so. None of the Jews, but not of them, is a worshipper of God. . . . Since they have disowned the Father, crucified the Son, and rejected the Spirit's help, who would dare to assert that the synagogue is not a home of demons! God is not worshipped there; it is simply a house of idolatry. . . . The Jews live for their bellies, they crave for the goods of this world. In shamelessness and greed they surpass even pigs and goats. . . . The Jews are possessed by demons, they are handed over to impure spirits. . . . Instead of greeting them and addressing them as much as a word, you should turn away from them as from a pest and a plague of the human race.

Yet this type of thing must be faced. Without some realization of the effects of the past 2000 years the Christian's approach to the Jew will be unknowing and irrelevant.

"We do not want to be mired down in the past," Rabbi Tanenbaum insisted, "but until Christians generally recognize the inner soul of the Jew in terms of his plight in history . . . we will talk in and around and above each other. . . . Jews think that Christians dismiss the past with too much of a let's-get-on-with-it attitude. At the point at which Christians and Jews begin to identify, there must be sensitivity. We can and must confront each other with understanding. But if we continue only to meet as icebergs—with seven-eighths of the facts under water—the realities of history will be our albatross. We must identify the problem of accumulated mistrust, enmity, half-truths, so we can tell each other, 'I know it; I understand.'"

Pius XII

Our Jewish guests expressed various shades of opinion concerning the Church's current open and friendly attitude. Rabbi Margolies was less impressed than Rabbi Tanenbaum by the efforts of Vatican II to put an end to anti-Semitism. He felt strongly that Pius XII should have spoken out on behalf of the Jews during World War II. The honesty and forthrightness of his expression afforded an insight into the depth of the feeling which many Jews surely share in varying degrees. Subsequently, many felt that this was one of the most valuable experiences of the Institute.

It was especially appropriate that a school of theology should sponsor an institute of this type. Rabbi Tanenbaum cited evidence indicating that many of the sources of anti-Semitism derive from inexact and careless theology and popular preaching. His presentation of the findings of an investigation of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious textbooks carried out jointly by St. Louis University, Yale, and Dropsie College was most revealing:

We have committed a great sin of, generation after generation, by and large, raising up our children, our future leaders, to commit their lives to noble professions of faith like "Love thy neighbor as thyself", and then they turn the page in their textbooks—"except the Protestant, except the Jew, except the Negro, except the racial ethnic group." We have, for example, found that up until very recently, up until the beginning of the 1960's (when the Catholic community began to take seriously this responsibility and to revise textbooks and the whole teaching process to take into account these contradictions) that Catholics have been teaching (with considerable exception, but there is enough documentary evidence to demonstrate) that, roughly, Protestants are heretics. Protestants have been teaching that Catholics are conspirators and Catholics and Protestants together have been teaching that Jews are unbelievers and therefore secularists. The Jews have returned the compliment by saying that the Christians are their oppressors. Thus we have had an almost unintentional web of mutual hatred which we have been communicating side by side and in contradiction with the noblest teachings of our faith.

This is a salutary reminder of the great need for sensitivity and responsibility in the presentation of God's word.

Some of the real surprises of the Institute came from the learned and engaging presentation of Jewish theological thought from Rabbi Petuchowski. His main topics were "Revelation and the Modern Jew," which included a discussion of belief in revelation in light of the modern scientific study of the biblical sources, and "The Bible of the Synagogue." Time after time Christian counterparts of movements and problems in Jewish thought became obvious. These ranged from the speaker's plea for the development of a Jewish theology (relevant to our current discussions of biblical versus systematic theology) through the authorship of the Pentateuch (J, E, P, D and all the rest) to the problem of the vernacular (the reform movement has had much experience with this) and a deep concern for greater religious education for the Jewish layman so that he might be more personally responsible for his religious life (the "emerging layman"). He demonstrated the inadequacy of the old stereotype, "Christians believe in creeds; Jews believe in deeds," and discussed the role of a living tradition in Reform Judaism.

The Kingdom is here

Another presentation of Jewish theology was made by Rabbi Margolies, and he summed this up quite well in a subsequent letter to the *National Catholic Reporter*:

In my own presentation on the subject of God and man in the tradition of Judaism I made no attempt to gloss over the basic and irreconcilable differences between Judaism and Catholicism. On the contrary, I spoke about the doctrine

of the Trinity as logically and even ethically untenable in Jewish eyes. I delineated the concept of original sin as indigestible from the Jewish point of view. I argued against the entire notion of vicarious atonement and salvation via intermediary agencies. And I underscored the great peril inherent in Catholic emphasis upon an otherworldly Kingdom of Heaven, forasmuch as it may easily lead to slothfulness in accomplishing that which must be accomplished here on earth. Naturally all of these points emerged from a positive presentation of such Judaic concepts as the absolute unity of God, the sinlessness of the newborn babe, the salvation of the individual in direct communication with his God and the inexorable prophetic mandate to pursue justice and to establish a replica of the Kingdom of the Almighty right here on earth.

The discussion of the dangers of "otherworldly" religion proved to be an excellent preparation for many ideas subsequently formulated by Harvey Cox in *The Secular City*. Rabbi Margolies contrasted strongly the anthropocentric emphasis of Judaism with Christian theocentricity. "Man was put on earth to help other men," he said. "The whole purpose of life is not the fulfilment of God, for God does not need fulfilment. By definition that which is perfect is not lacking. The purpose of creation and the purpose of the religion of Judaism is to fulfill man, for that is the will of God and was the will of God from the very beginning." Further discussion by David Rabinovitz, Executive Director of the Jewish Federation and Council of Greater Kansas City, described how the Jewish community is organized to provide for this fulfilment of man and the welfare of its members. He stressed the role of lay leadership in the social welfare movement among Jews.

Reactions

In order to evaluate the Institute, an informal questionnaire was distributed to the theologians afterwards. About half of those who had participated responded. The reactions were almost unanimously positive. The following are typical of the answers to the question: "What profit did you gain from the institute?"

An understanding of some basic facts about Jews and their beliefs and reactions to Christians. Very important for my own understanding of the Old Testament and the present-day situation of the Jews. Elimination of some gross stereotypes.

Impetus to read about Jewish background of Gospel times.

Much better and deeper understanding of their religious attitudes which I was incorrectly informed on and a deeper sympathy for their sufferings and feelings.

A human understanding of the depth of feeling of Jews toward Christians. An inchoative answer to my previous puzzlement about Jews as religious persons.

I am now beginning to understand how a Jew thinks and feels—especially

that his prejudices are not ungrounded—regarding help to parochial schools. He is sincere and willing to communicate. Would like to have further possible attendance at their services.

The beginnings of understanding and effective sympathy.

The values of an institute of this type are further evident in light of the fact that of those who responded to the questionnaire two-thirds stated that they had never discussed religion with a Jew before. Approximately one-third had never conversed socially with a Jew before.

Follow-up

This meeting was meant to be an introduction. In this sense it leaves us facing the future with questions and wondering where the relationship will go from here. As in any friendship, development will depend on the openness and proximity of those involved. Habits of isolation must be replaced by easy and knowledgeable intercourse. However, experience of riches of religious wisdom and theological thought which are almost totally unknown in Christian circles creates a desire for continued contact.

Areas of common concern which could serve as a basis for further dialogue were suggested by Rabbi Tanenbaum: first, the need for increased scholarly study and research in Christian-Jewish relations at the seminary level to help overcome considerable mutual ignorance and misinformation; second, the need to create new means of effective communication between Catholic seminarians and the Jewish community through direct contacts, seminars, institutes, and specialized publications; finally, the need to advance common works of charity and social justice in such area as race relations, the anti-poverty campaign and international affairs.

There has already been some follow-up. Rabbi Sapinsley, who spoke on Wisdom literature during the Institute, returned to St. Mary's for two lectures to those taking the Introduction to the Old Testament course. On these occasions he spoke on Genesis and the messianic prophesies in Isaiah. In addition, the Institute proceedings are currently being published.

For those who might consider a similar institute, a few words about the preparations might be helpful. Since there are some problems involved in having representatives of the different Jewish traditions, i.e., Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox, it is helpful to consult a knowledgeable representative of the Jewish community in the initial stages of planning. Rabbi Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee is happy to perform this service. Moreover, there are dietary considerations which must be taken into account if meals are to be served to Jewish guests.

Some preliminary familiarization of the audience with Jewish life and thought is helpful. In this matter also Rabbi Tanenbaum's office is most helpful in suggesting suitable literature. Arrangements were also made for us to attend the Sabbath services in a local synagogue, and this provided an excellent contact prior to the Institute.

In a sense, the Institute left us with a burden. We want to continue the dialogue and increase the participants, and this requires continued assurances to the Jewish community of our sincerity and seriousness in this enterprise. A long and unhappy history is not forgotten in a day. Sensitivities remain and our only adequate response is an openness and courtesy springing from genuine charity.

THOMAS N. LAY, S.J.

REPORT: INSTITUTE ON JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS WOODSTOCK, MARYLAND

WOODSTOCK EXPERIENCED A HEADY DOSE OF "ECUMENISM" on the weekend of January 21–24, 1966. Friday evening the College conducted a joint Bible service with Lutherans and Presbyterians. Sunday and Monday, the American Jewish Committee and Woodstock College sponsored jointly a two-day dialogue on the subject of Jewish-Christian relations. Both ventures were remarkably successful. This report concerns the Institute.

The program of talks was organized along historical lines. The first talk, by Rabbi Jacob Agus (of the Congregation Beth El, Baltimore), treated the New Testament-Rabbinic period. On Sunday evening Monford Harris (of the College of Jewish Studies, Chicago) spoke on Judaism and Christianity in the Middle Ages. The following morning, Prof. Joseph Blau (of Columbia University's Department of Religion) discussed the Enlightenment and Modern periods of Judaism. The community broke up for small discussion seminars after Monday's lunch, taking up such topics as the organization of the Jewish community, Judaism and social action, and contemporary trends in Judaism. The concluding speech, on future prospects for Jewish-Christian relations, was given by Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, who, as at the St. Mary's Institute, had been a principal force behind the whole meeting. The choice of this historical framework as an organizing principle was a

happy one. It carried two distinct advantages: it prominently highlighted the still-vital Jewish tradition of thinking primarily in historico-theological terms; it recast nineteen centuries of shared history from the Jewish perspective. To say the very least, both these aspects generated refreshing currents for question and reflection.

Before attempting to outline the general course of the talks and discussions, it must be noted that all three major divisions of Jewish faith were represented at the Institute: Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed, as well as opinion which fit into none of these categories. As might be expected, considerable diversity of viewpoint among the speakers was apparent. It was equally manifest that for the Jews such variety indicated a healthy state of affairs. Essential to the rabbinic tradition, as was repeatedly pointed out, is the ingredient of divergent interpretation, disciples who disagree with their masters, and different schools of thought. A constant question on the lips of the Jesuits present was: What constitutes the unifying factor among Jews? Even to this, different responses were given, but the answer seems to lie not in any official hierarchy (the rabbis are not this), but in an elastic fidelity to Jews' historic role as People of the Covenant and Torah.

In what follows, I shall sketch some of the leading ideas exchanged during the course of the meetings. Obviously, many of the issues which occupied the St. Mary's Institute were discussed also at Woodstock. I shall try then to avoid reiterating, and pass on to several questions which seem to have been distinctive of the Woodstock gathering.

Rabbi Agus raised an issue cutting at the root of any and all ecumenical dialogue. At one level, it is a linguistic problem—namely, that words like salvation, faith, the Kingdom of God, Pharisees, the Law, Israel, the elect, etc.—words which Catholics and Jews share in common—bear different meanings within our respective communities. Thus, the claim that the Old Testament constitutes common ground between us, and therefore a locus of shared faith, must be put down as naive oversimplification. The semantic confusion that must inevitably follow from neglecting the diverse connotations of identical words arises from a more fundamental difference at the level of subjective orientation, the level of personal commitment within a community of faith with its own distinctive historic tradition. According to Agus, there can be no meaningful dialogue between Christians and Jews about articles of faith issuing from communal subjectivity. In his view, attempts in that direction lead to puerile conversionist tactics which refuse to respect the inviolability of another's belief. All is not lost, however (some thought at this point the Institute had come to abrupt conclusion!), since the subjective orientations of believing communities live in tension with an "objective"

world, the universe of physical fact and human artifact, with which the rival claims of subjective communal traditions must be harmonized. Thus, Jew and Christian can work together to understand the past more objectively, disposing of the stereotype myths they entertain about each other, and also collaborate to forge the intellectual and sociological instruments "whereby the spirit of faith might permeate our common contemporary culture."

Agus' distinction between the subjective and objective, and, more particularly, the implications he drew from it, were controverted points during the ensuing discussions.

Monford Harris and Joseph Blau dealt, respectively, with Judaism in the Middle Ages, and Judaism in the Enlightenment and Modern Periods. Rabbi Tanenbaum's talk also referred to the Middle Ages and the altogether different readings that Jew and Christian give to them. As Tanenbaum illustrated by reading from Philip Hughes' history of the period and then, for contrast, from Solomon Grayzel's *History of the Jews*, the Crusades are for the one a "holy war" of liberation, and for the other an unmitigated massacre of Jews throughout Christendom. Harris reinforced the same theme. This period was, for the Jew, a time of great piety and literary creativity, but above all, a time of martyrdom at the hands of Christians who exhibited a "religious totalitarianism." To be sure, there were exchanges on the intellectual level, Aquinas or Meister Eckhart employing the authority Maimonides, for instance, or the influence of Christian monastic ideals upon the thirteenth century *Sefer Hasidim* by the mystic community leader, Rabbi Judah the Pious. But more typical were the acrimonious ritual debates between converted Jews and their former coreligionists, staged mainly for the humiliation of the latter, and often enough resulting in pogroms and book-burnings. There were exceptions, but in general, the record is an unsavory one of confinement to ghettos, restriction of civil liberties, and placement in a societal no-man's land.

Several essential misapprehensions need correcting in the light of all this. Prominent among them are the fact that modern Judaism is the product of Pharisaism, of the moral, spiritual and intellectual insights of scholarly rabbis. Further, Jesus' criticism of the Pharisees and Scribes merely echoes the Talmudic tradition itself, which warns against the dangers of legalism and external observance. Nonetheless, the Pharisaic tradition is what has kept alive in Judaism the summons to go "beyond the Law," and through phenomena like the eighteenth century Hassidic movement in Poland, the Jews have maintained in the face of persecution a living witness to God's word in history. It is especially the rabbinic tradition which, in keeping alive midrashic and pesharitic

commentaries on Scripture, has continually brought this word into relevant dialogue with contemporary events.

Professor Blau pointed out the paradoxical phenomenon which gradual emancipation of the Jews, culminating in the seasons of American and French revolutions, posed for the Jewish community. The medieval half-life imposed upon the Jews had the advantage of strengthening their communal integrity by enforcing a strict conformity to every detail of the pattern of Jewish law. The Renaissance saw the Jews emerge as a distinct cultural force, but with the Enlightenment and Revolutionary periods, they attained political emancipation into a world which emphasized individual talent and mobility, thus inevitably weakening the corporate bonds of tradition. The Jews were thus brought early to face the problems of *aggiornamento*, how to adapt their changeless faith to accelerating secularization. For the Jew, the fact that religion was no longer central, that the state had become secularized, had made possible his acceptance as a free citizen on a par with Christians. This opened up radical opportunities for self-realization previously forbidden to him. At the same time it decreased the influence of the ecclesiastical polity. This anomaly brought to the fore the latent potential of his tradition which had always affirmed all existence as holy, and viewed the sacred and the profane as complementary. Any human activity may be "Torah," and classic Jewish piety is one of involvement in the world.

The above facts account for the great sympathy Western European and American Jews entertain for the ideals of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution; while equally, the main divisions of modern Jewry, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed, can be understood as variant hypotheses for the solution of the problem of retaining the benefits of emancipation without losing what Agus referred to as their distinctive "communal subjectivity." Blau considers that the special "mission of Israel" rests in its particular way of integrating, in the face of modern fragmentation, the commandments and religious mystery into "the sanctity of the life of everyday."

The upsurge of Romantic racialism in the nineteenth century, however, had unfortunate consequences for this ideal. Europe once again insisted on Jewish particularism, and in self-defense the Zionist movement and the state of Israel were the results. While not denying certain positive contributions of the latter for both Jewry and the world at large, Blau obviously regretted that it has tended to identify the Jewish heritage along exclusively ethnic lines, thereby crowding out the universalism of prophetic Judaism. Blau did not hesitate to lay considerable blame for this inversion of values upon Jewish religious leadership, who,

he believes, have stressed the *people* and undervalued what he termed Israel's *mission*.

Rabbi Tanenbaum's talk took up many concrete proposals for collaboration between Christians and Jews, substantially the same as those he discussed at the St. Mary's meeting. What distinguished his talk here was his extemporaneous and very moving interpretation of Vatican II in contrast with Vatican I. Speaking for the Jew, he claimed that Vatican I was the crystallization of a centuries-long tradition of siege-mentality in the Church, triumphantly proclaiming itself as *the* truly established Church in the West. It was a Church that rejected the world and preoccupied itself with self-preservation. With such an institution, the Jew could have nothing to do. Tanenbaum saw Vatican II as the radical abjuration of this attitude of impenetrability, a Church turning outward and embracing the aspirations of mankind. He said that the Council statement on the Jews must be interpreted in the light of the moving speeches which resounded in the *aula* of St. Peter's, declaring this newfound faith. It was clear that he regards Vatican II to have worked a genuine revolution in Catholic thinking which the documents often articulate only awkwardly.

It was a constantly reiterated theme among the speakers at the Woodstock Institute that both Christians and Jews must rid themselves of the mythic stereotypes they entertain about each other. There were many shattered myths after these two days, both of which proved intensely stimulating and bright with promise for the future.

David S. Toolan, S.J.

READERS' FORUM

Loss of Faith

Fr. J. G. Milhaven's suggestions in "On Loss of Faith" (*WL*, Winter, 1966) about how to deal helpfully with problems of faith are, I think, demonstrably and, for the cases they envision, probably uniquely sound. Their homeliness and simplicity make it all the more astonishing that they should be, as it appears, so widely overlooked.

I would suggest, however, that the line of thought which dictates Fr. Milhaven's solution to his second case is not so totally absent from Catholic writing as he believes. It seems to me that both the case and the solution are clearly envisioned, and in their extremest form, by at least one classic passage of genuinely great Catholic literature, namely, in the 233rd of Pascal's *Pensées*. It is the latter and pragmatic portion of this passage, the acting out of the wager rather than the preceding ingenious introduction of it, that I have chiefly in mind. The whole section should be read, but at least for readers who retain some memory of it the following excerpt may prove suggestive:

> Travaillez donc, non pas à vous convaincre par l'augmentation des preuves de Dieu, mais par la diminution de vos passions. Vous voulez aller à la foi, et vous n'en savez pas le chemin; vous voulez vous guérir de l'infidélité, et vous en demandez le remède: apprenez de ceux qui ont été liés comme vous, et qui parient maintenant tout leur bien; ce sont gens qui savent ce chemin que vous voudriez suivre, et guéris d'un mal dont vous voulez guérir. Suivez la maniere par où ils ont commencé: c'est en faisant tout comme s'ils croyaient, en prenant de l'eau bénite, en faisant dire des messes, etc. Naturellement même cela vous fera croire et vous abêtira.—'Mais c'est ce que je crains.'—Et pourquoi? qu'avez-vous à perdre?

I am inclined to think that what Pascal proposes here is, in the essentials of its religious psychology, reducible to Fr. Milhaven's idea, differing from the latter only in particulars of rhetoric and abstractness of example.

James Gaffney, S.J.
St. Ignatius Retreat House
Manhasset, N.Y.

The Graduate School Trap

"Self-Renewal in Jesuit High Schools," by Robert R. Newton, S.J. (*WL*, Winter, 1966), analyzes well many of the suspicions I have had during regency. Lack of professional interest and initiative is apparent among some Jesuits on a high school faculty, but I feel that it is only the surface of a much deeper problem now facing our secondary schools.

Superiors have spared no cost or effort to give their scholastics the finest possible education. This is to their credit. For the high schools, however, this increasing involvement in graduate studies represents a real crisis. Young Jesuits, from the juniorate on, now plan their studies with a view to graduate school. Many hope for doctoral studies, even during regency, and professors rightly encourage scholarly interest in the new developments in physics, sociology, or history. Esteem

in professional circles is, as it has always been, presented as a superb apostolate. What occurs then is a conferral of status on the scholar and college professor as somehow "more Jesuit" than the high school teacher. Since today all scholastics are at least exposed to graduate study before regency, many more become hypnotized by the status conferred on those with graduate degrees. Ironically, under this hypnosis, some forget that their original inspiration to enter the Society came from their high school teachers.

For many regents, high school teaching is merely a valuable stop on the way to ordination. Many want to return to high school after ordination, but it is because of the apostolic opportunities presented in the classroom and counseling rather than for teaching itself. All but a few of those interested in a field of study would prefer to be scholars of modest accomplishment than high school teachers of excellence. What I am trying to say is that our training prepares us for scholarship rather than for teaching. Those interested in high school look upon the classroom as a means rather than an end, and this view can hardly be condemned. However, the teacher who sees his classroom as a contact point with young men will be more likely to devote his time to class counseling than developing a visual method for teaching Latin vocabulary.

The present status structure in the scholasticates, stretching from graduate school professor to parish curate is a non-conceptualized structure with many variations. While it exists, it will be easier to develop nuclear physicists, television directors, and poets than a large number of professionally interested high school educators. We have many excellent teachers, but their devotion to their students leaves little time or energy for journals, conventions, or experimentation.

I am more optimistic about the lack of initiative that Mr. Newton finds on high school faculties. Recently the lay teachers have begun to work more closely with the Jesuits on committees and in departments. These younger laymen are no longer willing to wait for instructions to sift down from the administration; they are professional educators with a reasonable demand to be treated as full contributing members of the faculty. This spirit is spreading to the Jesuits. The layman seems to be helping the Jesuit teacher assume his responsibility for syllabus and curriculum change.

A de-emphasis of graduate study or an exhortation to creative responsibility will not remedy either of these two problems. Closer cooperation between the scholasticates and the high schools may provide a partial answer. Regular conferences from high school administrators, frank discussions of problems and aspirations rather than a series of hollow sales talks might stimulate some interest in the field of secondary education. A novice trial at a high school or a boys' retreat house, a program of tutoring, moderating, and coaching for juniors and philosophers, where geography permits, and part-time counseling work might keep the idea of high school education among the possible avocations before the young Jesuit becomes trapped in the graduate school value system.

RICHARD A. BLAKE, S.J.
Xavier High School, New York

FAITH AND THE ADOLESCENT

Crisis of Faith. *By Pierre Babin.* New York: Herder & Herder, 1964. Pp. 251. $4.50.

Faith and the Adolescent. *By Pierre Babin.* New York: Herder & Herder, 1965. Pp. 128. $2.95.

In the first of these volumes, Pierre Babin presents us with a religious psychology of adolescence, searching the depths of youth through the eyes of a Christian believer for his idea of God and the way he encounters the divinity. Because adolescence is a period of maturation, constituting a crisis in the process of human growth, the young person's reaction to the objective realities of the Gospel and the Church must also evolve through a period of crisis if the act of faith is to become a reality and mature.

First, the question has to be asked: Are the signs of faith available to the adolescent? Is the faith meaningful to him? In reply Babin shows the importance of three factors in disposing a person to religious commitment: the sense of the sacred, moral life, and the need for redemption. Of particular interest to us who are Christian educators is Babin's point that we have continually to ask ourselves if we are being faithful to Him whom we signify. Often preoccupation with problems of purity, insistence on certain religious practices, and outmoded discipline crowd out positive direction in living the Christian life in joy, peace, service of others, and commitment to justice and charity. For example, rather than an attempt at intensifying the sense of the religious in youth by means of the liturgy, which naturally lends itself to the adolescent fascination with ritual and symbol, students are exhorted simply to frequent confession or reception of Communion, isolated from their rightful place of celebration in the Christian community. Without an adequate explanation of the meaning of Scripture and sacramental worship, coupled with a varied and rich usage of them throughout the liturgical year, how is a student to be stimulated to a greater appreciation of his faith, to the extent that he can replace selfish preoccupations with Christian awareness and love?

Another possible pitfall in religious education is the inadequate relationship of the complementary testimonies: first, of religious, whose way of life emphasizes the eschatological aspect of faith; secondly, that

of lay people, whose characteristic is commitment to the world in charity; and finally, that of priests, whose function is to bring God to men from "on high," with the consequence of having little power as signs for young people. The author suggests that just as in religious institutions the signs are distorted primarily through lack of fidelity to values of the Incarnation, so in public schools there is such infidelity to transcendent values that the sign of the spiritual, eternal quality of God's presence in the world can hardly be recognized. I would submit that at times this double tragedy can exist in any of our own schools, where many in the religious community are almost totally given over to their personal duties, to the shameful neglect of their students, while a lesser number of well-intentioned but untrained personnel unsuccessfully attempt to maintain administrative and guidance areas. The inevitable result will be a heavy burden placed upon a few conscientious faculty members in undertaking an unreasonably large amount of co-curricular and guidance activities, in addition to giving Christian witness through their primary occupation of teaching.

The second and third parts of the book, devoted to the potential impacts of education upon youth, emphasize basic needs: understanding, i.e., primarily presence and relationship to the adolescent; love, i.e., the teacher must act under the compelling impulse of Christ's infinite generosity; direction in such a prudent way that the young individual is able to discover his abilities and begin making his own contributions to history. This latter "catechesis of vocation" is of primary importance because it means that our proclamation of the Good News must be such that the adolescent can recognize and discover himself within the very message which we proclaim. What we say to him is actually the word of God, which he will hopefully be able to fulfill in his life. It must be a message of freedom, awareness of others, the Christian sense of history, universality, and such that it awakens a personal love of Christ. Perhaps this volume would be best recommended as a serious examination of conscience for those of us involved in the education of youth.

A synthetic essay

Babin's second volume represents a deeper treatment of the problem of God in the world of the adolescent. It is basically an attempt to shed light on the initial question, asked of 1800 students ranging in age from thirteen to twenty years, "For you, what is God?" A synthetic essay on the religious mentality of the adolescent, it takes into consideration his psychology, his place in the world, and his education.

The major characteristics of his sense of God are three: naturation, or the mentality in which God is the term of man's efforts, unrelated

to the God of revelation; egomorphism, or the mentality in which one's concept of God or relationship with Him seems profoundly determined by the psychosociological conditions of the subject's personality; and the ethical sense, or the mentality according to which relationship with God is strongly influenced by subjective needs for moral excellence and controlled by the image of God as creator rather than by the personal encounter with Christ as brother. All of these characteristics are inherently dangerous because of their religious immanentism. As Fr. Babin points out, God is not a man, nor is he an idealized adolescent. It is the educator's role to point out that God must be sought where He Himself speaks, thus insuring the primacy of revelation. The adolescent's moral effort will then be seen not as a subjective striving after his own ideal but as a response to the God who calls him.

A further development of the third characteristic is the investigation of God as Father, a rewarding search, in that it reveals, first of all, youth's heightened sensitivity to similarities between different levels of being. The adolescent tends to confuse God's transcendence with the absolute of an analogy, i.e., his human father. Secondly, it reveals that adolescents tend to be overly attached to the aspect of similarities, thereby unable to admit of a paternity which would be of another order and quality than their own father. It is readily seen how the authority conflict can be so expanded as to absorb and distort the religious sense of the young person. Here the educator must make him conscious of the transformation in covenant with Christ his brother, which is being accomplished by degrees in him, so that he can recognize he is a son of the Father with Christ, as he reconsiders his natural sonship with his earthly father. Of primary importance also is the simultaneous reconsideration of the heavenly Father as Creator and Lord and of the earthly father as procreator and head of the family. Concluding with an attempt to specify the purpose of adolescence from the perspective of a religious genetics, Babin re-emphasizes the need to correlate the natural sense of God with the God of revelation, to make a personal discovery of the Incarnation.

Because of the author's deep insight and technical approach to the subject it is recommended that this volume be studied thoughtfully and kept available for frequent reference. It offers much of value to the counselor as well as to the educator in general, but it should be kept in mind that the data was collected and interpreted in a French setting. We sincerely hope that similar efforts on the part of American Catholic psychologists may soon be instigated by Babin's two provocative studies.

R. K. Judge, S.J.

DISCIPLINED SELFHOOD

Adolescents and the Challenge of Maturity. *By Alexander A. Schneiders.* Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965. Pp. 205. $4.95.

There are many ways of writing books about adolescents. Some authors raise the theoretical questions about the uneven development of intellectual, physical, and social competencies, the somewhat hypocritically lofty expectancies which a shallow-valued society has concerning its teenagers, and the anxiety and confusion which adolescents may experience on any of these counts. The approach is valuable in terms of research, but the conclusions are too bare and subtle to aid the general practitioner, parent or teacher. "This may be why the adolescent is the way he is, but what's a mother to do?" the reader responds. Another book may give a neat compendium of Rules for Dealing with the Adolescent: On the Allowance, On Sex Instruction, On Dating, On Drinking, On the Car, On Discipline. The teenager's life is neatly divided into compartments having no relation to each other or to his overall existence. The first approach has all the big questions and a scarcity of practicable answers; the second, all the answers to the wrong type of question. Neither has what counts. We cannot understand behavior, still less alter it, unless we realize what the behavior is aimed toward and appreciate the individual context within which the hoped-for end must be sought.

Schneiders does this. The important things about his adolescent are that he is a unique individual and that he is going someplace. He is not The Adolescent, caught up in the "Inevitable *Sturm und Drang*" of a directionless, which is to say, meaningless, movement. He is a particular person who in terms of his unique past experience, present situation, and future hopes, is trying to grow toward that elusive treasure: maturity. Once the teenager's behavior is seen as a personal process, in a social context, leading (awkwardly, perhaps even unsuccessfully) toward the goal of maturity, it becomes considerably easier both to understand and to guide him. Teenagers do not all have the same problems. Even what seem like the same problems should not be met by the same responses, dictated from a book of rules. Problems that appear similar often have quite different meanings because of the unique context in which they are experienced. To bend Freud's metaphor a bit, most icebergs look pretty much the same, but if you probe beneath what's visible, you may find that what you can see is related to a strong and healthy substructure, or

it may, despite its pretentiousness, be connected to nothing at all and ready to sink at the slightest nudge.

What does determine the appropriate response? How is a mother or father or teacher to know what to do? The problem is mainly one of sensitivity and communication, and this is not, as anyone knows from his own experience, exclusively the concern of teenagers. Development of these two talents and the sense of mutuality which is created by them is central to successful interpersonal relations on any level: between spouses, siblings, teammates, diplomats, and nations. It must, of course, be a two-way path. The parents' task is, then, to develop a sensitivity for what the teenager is trying to do, communicate this feeling to their child, and guide him in a way which will contribute more effectively to the process in which he is involved. Of course the adolescent must learn to develop the same sensitivity with regard to his parents, but rather than take the initiative he will learn it by experiencing the sensitivity communicated by his parents. The net result can be a surprise to both parties: they are aiming at the same goal.

Nurturing a sensitivity for the adolescent's point of view, is, alas, not as easy as we might think. Perhaps the problem lies in too much thinking about, and not enough feeling with, the teenager. What many parents think is a major problem in a child's behavior, the teenager feels is a solution to a problem which the parents or teacher do not appreciate. It is his way of trying to emerge a mature person, even if what he feels is mature behavior isn't.

Maturity and discipline

What does Schneiders think maturity is? It is rather clear by now. The goal of the process is responsible disciplined selfhood. It must lead to the actualization of the teenager's own selfhood, his personal existence. When this selfhood has emerged and been accepted, we say that the person has achieved self-identity: awareness of his personal role, sexuality, status, goal, his relation to society. How is he going to do it? By establishing a hierarchy of values beginning with responsibility to self, meeting reality as it really is, and relating positively to others. These, combined with regular and responsible decision making, will lead to maturity.

Schneiders' approach to discipline is worth noting. He sees a contrast between discipline and punishment. Discipline is channeling or limiting behavior to reach further maturity. Note the criterion: discipline is limitation which assists growth, even if imposing the limitation may be distasteful to both parent and child. Discipline reflects a state of order. Punishment, on the contrary, is negative and repressive. It is more likely to interfere with growth than to promote it. Still, punishment must on

occasion be used—when the behavior cannot be channeled and simply must be repressed. As dimensions of maturity become manifested in more and more areas of personality, punishment should be gradually eliminated.

Most of the adolescent's perceptions of the world (and consequently, his reactions to the world) are determined by his interpersonal relationships. Here Schneiders stresses the family and its importance in creating a favorable emotional climate. The job is one for brothers and sisters, not only for mother and fathers. The importance of sibling relationships is neglected in many texts which stress parent-child relations as though the rest of the family didn't exist. Schneiders points out that everyone plays an important part in creating an atmosphere which makes the home something to be avoided and rebelled against, or somewhere to come and grow. Either reaction is often projected upon persons and situations outside the family.

The book, then, is neither a theoretical treatise nor a handbook of how to handle your child. It offers a good deal of wisdom, distilled from a professional's easeful familiarity with pertinent theory and research, and from the human sensitivity of a father and clinician. It is valuable reading for anyone concerned with the adolescent in the modern world.

C. Donnelly, S.J.

SELECTED READINGS IN CONJUGAL SPIRITUALITY

(Listing prepared and commented upon by Fr. George B. Wilson, S.J., professor of dogmatic theology at Woodstock College.)

Marriage and the Love of God. *By Justin Gosling.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965. Pp. 162. $3.50.

This new volume is the finest work on conjugal spirituality in English to date. All the richness of Caffarel's *Marriage is Holy* is here presented in a more clearly articulated theo-logical framework and a less lyrical style. As the title would suggest, the book is far removed from mere conjugal casuistry and aims at presenting a strict spirituality. Setting marriage first in the all-important perspective of *vocation to holiness in the context of the Church*, the author, himself the father of two children, goes on to reflect on marriage in the different stages of salvation-history. Then the way is cleared for examining the nature of married love and its relation to bodily union, charity, humility, and chastity. The concluding discussion of the relation between marriage and consecrated virginity provides some important insights into this question which is intimately connected to the priest-counselor's own attitudes towards marriage.

The Wonder of Sex. *By Jack and Barbara Willke.* Cincinnati: Hiltz, 1964. Paperback. Pp. 115. $1.50.

Since it is one of the central responsibilities of the married couple's vocation, the imparting of a solid Christian sex education to their children assumes a significant importance in any realistic conjugal spirituality. Dr. and Mrs. Willke are CFMers from Cincinnati and were instrumental in establishing a program for the psychosexual formation of all the women religious of that archdiocese. Their little book marks an important step forward for Catholic literature on the subject because, besides offering general and very practical suggestions on the when and how and how-much of sex education, it brings out in a very concrete way all of the subtle ways in which the young child's attitude toward sexuality is continually being formed before and during the years of actual instruction. These factors are crucial and yet sadly overlooked in most treatments of the subject. This book should be required reading for all Catholic parents—when their children are still very young.

Healthy Attitudes Towards Love and Sex. *By Dr. C. J. Trimbos.* New York: Kenedy, 1965. Pp. 224. $4.50

The Christian understanding of and attitude toward sexuality are absolutely central, not only for the married couple, but also for the priest who would counsel them, since his own attitudes will influence every response he gives to their needs. This work by a Dutch psychiatrist at the Amsterdam Catholic Mental Health Clinic offers a balanced view which could be of invaluable assistance to the celibate counselor in exploring and assessing the foundations of his own attitudes towards sex and —perhaps more importantly—sexuality. In fostering a proper orientation in the counselor the book will indirectly contribute much to the help of married couples; it goes without saying that it can be used in direct reading by the couple as well.

The Church and Sex. *By R. F. Trevett.* Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965. Deus Books Paperback. Pp. 114. $0.95.

Originally part of the Twentieth-Century Encyclopedia series, this brief work provides a fine speculative orientation for situating sex within the perspective of such broad theological themes as creation, sin, grace, and redemption. Much Catholic literature on marriage counseling has been inadequate precisely because of the lack of this fundamentally theological orientation, resulting in a Band-Aid approach to conjugal spirituality. Though this book will provide no "solution" to the actual handling of marital situations, the basic speculative structure which it elaborates should pervade the counselor's whole approach to his task and thus arm him against the dangers of the case-study approach.